DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 028 880 RC 003 383

By-Goodwin, William L., Ed.; Cieslak, Paul J., Ed.

Bucknell Conference on Facilitating the Learning of the Migrant Child. Report of Proceedings (August 19-30, 1968).

Pub Date 68

Note-166p.

EDRS Price MF-$0.75 HC-$8.40

Descriptors-Annotated Bibliographies, Conference Reports, Educational Games, Evaluation Methods, Illustrations, *Learning Processes, *Migrant Children, Migrant Education, *Models, Objectives, Participant Involvement, *Participant Satisfaction, *Program Evaluation, Surveys, Teaching Techniques

Activities of a 2-week conference dealing with facilitating the learning of the migrant child are evaluated. A brief historical review is presented to explain the reasons for this conference and a previous conference and cites differences between the 2 conferences. Analyses of performance and attitudes of the participants during the conference and a follow-up of participants' post-conference behaviors are included. Additionally reported are the conference objectives; events and activities; evaluations of activities and participants' performances on cognitive and affective instruments; and recommendations growing out of the 2 conferences. The appendix contains the facilitation of learning model, lists of staff and participants, an extensive annotated bibliography, a lecture presentation, a verbatim transcription of observations of teachers after visiting schools for migrant children, and evaluation instruments. (SW)

BUCKNELL CONFERENCE

FACILITATING the LEARNING of the MIGRANT CHILD

BUCKNELL UNIVERSITY / LEWISBURG, PENNSYLVANIA / 1968

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

BUCKNELL CONFERENCE

on

FACILITATING THE LEARNING

# of the

MIGRANT CHILD

A Report of Proceedings for the Conference held August 19-30, 1968

Edited By

Dr. William L. Goodwin
and
Mr. Paul J. Cieslak
Department of Education
Bucknell University

PREFACE

The primary purpose of this booklet is evaluative. It takes a critical look at the activities of the 1968 Conference and, on certain related topics, considers the 1967 Conference. An effort has been made to make the evaluation as objective as possible because of the belief that information thus recorded would be of maximal utility in any future undertaking with migrant children, whether by ourselves or other groups.

This document represents only one source of information about the two Bucknell Conferences concerning the migrant child. Also available is the 1967 Conference booklet on Learning Problems of the Migrant Child, which features papers presented by four consultants as well as their group position. Further, growing out of the 1968 Conference are two video tapes which concern diagnosing migrant children's reading difficulties via the Durrell Analysis of Reading Difficulty. A 16 mm color, sound movie was also made of the 1968 Conference.

It is fitting to note the extensive administrative assistance provided by scores of Bucknell employees in supporting the Conference. Gratitude is also expressed to the migrant camp owners who agreed to let participants visit and, of course, to the migrant children who attended the sessions to work with the teacher-participants.

It is also appropriate at this point to indicate the extensive support given this Conference by the staff. Assisting as the Administrative Coordinator was Paul Cieslak, while Irv Rubincam directed the efforts of Bill Aydelott, Charles DeVoe, and Bob Dunkerly with regard to all media, primarily film and video tape. The instructional responsibilities were carried magnificently by Marlene Scardamalia, Pat Rugh, Jean Osborn, and Kathy Dauber with occasional assistance from Paul Cieslak and me. Serving in the vital role as liaison between participants and staff was Sally Leonard, while to Mary Ezell fell the laborious task of initial analysis of all types of data. Christine Hill maintained a unique one-room school for migrant children with unflinching dignity and determination. The editing of the movie film was conducted primarily by Jean DeVoe after all types of conflicting advice from Irv Rubincam, Jean Eddowes, and me. The secretarial responsibilities during the Conference were enthusiastically handled by Donna Derr and Marilyn (Walter) Lee with the former responsible for much of the final preparation of this booklet. The photographs in this report were selected, developed, and personalized under the patient hand of Jean DeVoe.

As to the hectic pace maintained by the staff during the two-week Conference, let it be said that never before have so few planned so late for so many days in a row.

Dr. William L. Goodwin
Conference Coordinator

Shown here with part of his family, the owner of a farm on which a migrant camp is located answers questions of participants about his use of migrant laborers.

At the migrant camp, this young migrant girl looks somewhat reserved as she is asked whether she would like to come to school.

Participant Ted Andrewlevich, Head Teacher of the Oaklyn Elementary School, Shikellamy School District, Sunbury, Pennsylvania, gives the **Durrell Analysis of Reading Difficulty** to a migrant boy.

This migrant girl is responding to the **Durrell Analysis of Reading Difficulty** given her by participant Nelson Wilcox, Head Teacher of the Porter Elementary School, Jersey Shore Area School District, Jersey Shore, Pennsylvania.

Mrs. Jean Osborn, Head Teacher at the Bereiter-Engelmann Preschool, Institute for Research on Exceptional Children, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois, conducts a highly effective demonstration of the Bereiter Technique with a group of migrant children.

In this exercise, Mrs. Osborn is teaching the youngsters the concept of vehicle.

Physical contact is often used with the direct teaching methods called the Bereiter Technique.

This migrant boy is playing a board game designed by conference participants; he is being observed by Mrs. Phyllis Unger, a teacher in the Shikellamy School District, Sunbury, Pennsylvania, and Miss Marlene Scardamalia, Conference Assistant.

When asked to think about her future aspirations, this migrant girl became quite reflective.

A movie has been made of Conference activities. Here, Mr. William Aydelott, Conference Photographer, records the reaction of a migrant boy who has just been asked what he hopes to be when he grows up.

BUCKNELL CONFERENCE ON FACILITATING THE LEARNING OF THE MIGRANT CHILD

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

I. Introduction 1

II. Objectives 8

III. Intended and Actual Conference Events 11

IV. Evaluation of the Conference 17

A. Results from Affective Surveys 17

B. Results from Cognitive Surveys 19

C. Results from Overall Evaluation Summary. 21

D. Results from Follow-up Questionnaire to Participants . . 44

E. Evaluation Results as Related to Objectives. 46

V. Recommendations. 51

Appendix A: The Facilitation of Learning Model. 57

Appendix B: Participants and Staff. 59

Appendix C: An Annotated Bibliography on the Education of the Migrant Child 63

Appendix D: Lecture by Jean Osborn. 88

Appendix E: Fishbowl of Six Participants on School Visits 102

Appendix F: Evaluation Instruments. 111

I. INTRODUCTION

This report concerns the Bucknell Conference on Facilitating the Learning of the Migrant Child, held at the Bucknell University campus from August 19 to August 30, 1968. This was the second conference conducted related to migrant children, the first having been in 1967, but the focuses of the two conferences were decidedly different. A short historical review should suffice to explain not only the reasons for the conferences, but also for their differences.

For decades, migrant agricultural workers, predominantly from the deep South, have come to the Susquehanna Valley in Pennsylvania each year in late summer and early fall. Often they bring their children with them. In October they return to their home bases, only to start again in April on their trek to the North following the crops. The antiquated modes of transportation used increase the time that the children are not in formal school settings. Providing for continuity in the educational experiences of such children is a dramatic problem.

In November, 1965, the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 was passed. Shortly thereafter, it was realized that this group of disadvantaged young people was not adequately covered by the Act. Accordingly, the Migrant Amendment was added to Title I of the basic act; this legislation provides children of migrant agricultural workers with more opportunities for learning.

The Pennsylvania Department of Public Instruction, in conducting its state-wide program with federal monies, decided initially to place emphasis in two main areas: providing special learning opportunities for migrant children in the schools that they attend in the fall and, in some cases, initiating summer schools for them; and, conducting inservice training for teachers and administrators who will be working with migrant children. Under the latter area, the Educational Development Center at Bucknell University was requested to hold two conferences.

During the week of August 13, 1967, Bucknell conducted a conference on the learning problems of the migrant child. This area of concentration was considered to be of merit because many of the physical needs of the migrant child (such as medical, subsistence, etc.) were being met by other agencies and personnel. The week's program had a dual purpose: training teachers from the Region to work more effectively with children of migrant agricultural workers; and, stimulating the formation of new ideas on possible solutions for these learning problems.

The first objective of the Conference was met by using professors from the Bucknell Department of Education. Dr. William H. Heiner, Dr. J. Charles Jones, Dr. Hugh F. McKeegan, and Dr. J. William Moore presented various aspects of migrant children's educational problems to the 20 conference participants. Dr. William L. Goodwin, also in the Department of Education, served as the Conference Coordinator, as he is also the Director of the Educational Development Center at Bucknell University.

The second conference objective was implemented by using four consultants. Because of a vivid lack of expertise in the area of the learning problems of migrant children, it was decided to utilize consultants naive on the specifics of the migrant situation, but with known reputations in learning theory and applications. The consultants used were: Dr. Clark C. Abt, President of Abt Associates, Inc., Cambridge, Massachusetts; Dr. Leslie D. McLean, Chairman of the Department of Computer Applications, The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, Toronto, Ontario, Canada; Dr. Donald M. Miller, Instructional Research Laboratory, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin; and Mrs. Jean Osborn, head teacher at the Bereiter-Engelmann Preschool, Institute for Research on Exceptional Children, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois. They were asked to do some original and adaptive thinking about the learning problems of the migrant child. In addition to presenting prepared papers, the consultants also had time to observe first-hand the manifestations of this problem, to interact, and to formulate a group position.

The major contributions of the 1967 Conference, in the form of consultant papers and the resultant group position, are contained in a document available from the Bucknell University Educational Development Center titled "Bucknell Conference on the Learning Problems of the Migrant Child."

In August of 1968, a second conference was conducted again at the request of the Pennsylvania Department of Public Instruction. As previously indicated, the emphasis in this two-week conference was substantially different than that of the previous summer. Several reasons for this change of focus existed.

First, it was felt that the consultants at the first year's conference had suggested stimulating model programs of considerable merit, but models representing significant departures from programs currently financed and also exceeding the readiness of various governmental educational agencies to initiate novel programs in working with migrant children. Second, in the interim while waiting for novel programs to appear, it was necessary to provide teachers with program ideas that could be implemented in September, 1968, with migrant children. Finally, it seemed vital to place the conference participants in frequent, meaningful, and direct contact with the children of migrant agricultural workers, specifically, in learning situations.

It is important to note that during the second conference emphasis was not directly focused on the learning problems of migrant children but rather upon techniques that the teacher could use to facilitate the learning of migrant children. This was a very pragmatic and realistic undertaking, yet highly developmental in nature. Given the fact that the conference participants did not have computers available to them — given the fact that they did not have specialists available to help them design short-unit curriculum packages — given the fact that they had no control over the arrival and departure times of migrant children — given only the fact that they would be meeting with migrant children in the fall in regular school settings, the focus of the conference was on how they might best proceed with the resources available to them.

Conference participants were trained to apply systematically certain procedures to help these children learn faster and more efficiently. The learning model used was a traditional one, applicable to many types of students. It consisted of diagnosing the student's strengths and weaknesses, establishing objectives for him, selecting and/or developing appropriate learning activities, and evaluating the resultant learning. Participants using the model were encouraged to view teaching at its best as a process of facilitating students' learning. The learning model is described in greater detail in Appendix A. Although a traditional learning model was used, emphasis was also placed on two rather innovative learning activities: the Bereiter-Engelmann Technique and educational games. To accelerate the teacher-training process, use was made of video-tape recorders and variations of recently developed micro-teaching techniques, permitting teachers to examine and critique their own teaching techniques via video tape.

Personnel playing key roles in the 1968 Conference were: Dr. William L. Goodwin, the coordinator; Mr. Paul J. Cieslak, associate coordinator for administration; Mr. Irvin R. Rubincam, associate coordinator for media; and, as teacher-training instructors, Mrs. Jean Osborn, Mrs. Kathy Dauber, Miss Marlene Scardamalia, and Miss Pat Rugh. A full list of Conference staff and participants appears in Appendix B.

This report is not intended, by itself, to convey all that happened at the 1968 Conference. Also available are two one-inch video tapes which were filmed before the Conference and detail procedures used by Dr. William Heiner of Bucknell's Department of Education in giving the Durrell Analysis of Reading Difficulty to disadvantaged learners, among them migrant children. Conference proceedings are also recorded on a 15-minute, 16 mm, color film which details well both the use of educational games and the Bereiter-Engelmann Technique.

As indicated in the Preface, the prevailing tone of this Conference Report is evaluative. In an attempt to make this report as useful as possible to any and all who might find themselves working hard to facilitate the learning of migrant children in the future, the predominant evaluative mode is critically objective. The evaluative review includes not only the performance and attitudes of the participants during the Conference, but also a follow-up of their post-Conference behaviors. Additionally, the activities and sessions of the Conference come under extensive review.

The format of this booklet has been established so that Conference objectives are first considered (Section II). Next reported are both the intended and actual transactions, before, during, and after the Conference (Section III). Section IV contains evaluations of all phases of the Conference, including consideration of the activities conducted, and participants' performances on cognitive and affective instruments;

the evaluation results are also related to the Conference objectives. The final section is concerned with recommendations growing out of the two conferences.

In addition to Appendix A which presents the facilitation of learning model and Appendix B which lists staff and participants, four other Appendices are included. Appendix C presents an updated revision of the 1967 Annotated Bibliography. In Appendix D is the lecture presentation made by Mrs. Jean Osborn before her highly effective demonstration with migrant children. Appendix E consists of a verbatim transcription of observations of teachers after visiting schools for migrant children. Evaluation instruments of interest are contained in Appendix F.

II. OBJECTIVES

The general orientation for this Conference, as well as the eight other conferences conducted in 1968 in Pennsylvania by other Educational Development Centers, was contained in "A State Plan to Regionalize and Expand Summer 1968 Educational Programs and Services for Children of Migratory Farm Labor Families in Pennsylvania." The document, written by state coordinator John Hyams, was published by the Pennsylvania Department of Public Instruction.

A more specific statement of purpose was contained in the service purchase contract between the State of Pennsylvania and Bucknell University:

> Bucknell University will be responsible for providing a two weeks' inservice training program for teachers/administrators of school-age migrant children... This two weeks' inservice training program is to provide teachers and administrators of migrant children with a structured opportunity to enhance their total understanding of the migrant child in his complexity of needs.

In operational terms, these general charges from the state were re-formulated into two main objectives for the Bucknell Conference:

(1) For the participants, providing viable techniques for facilitating the learning of migrant children, as well as providing opportunities for feedback from many sources to help participants develop their teaching skills with migrant children.

(2) For educators concerned with the learning activities of migrant children, providing information on the salient characteristics of the learning styles of the migrant children taking part in the conference.

These objectives were further clarified by these passages in the Prospectus sent to Conference participants:

> The focus of the conference will be upon maximizing the involvement of participants with migrant children in order to increase their skills as facilitators of learning for the migrant child. The participants will be trained to operate within a format of systematic instructional decision making, based initially upon diagnosis of learning problems. Emphasis will also be placed upon the development, field-testing, and evaluation of materials designed and produced by the participants.
>
> In addition, participants will become acquainted with several methods of facilitating learning. These methods could be classified as Traditional, Educational Games, and the Bereiter Technique. It is thought that an examination of the use of these techniques with migrant children will not only be of value to participants in their teaching but may also serve to generate new ideas on optimal learning conditions for the migrant child.
>
> The intended transactions of the conference can be classified into five categories: (1) Orientation; (2) Evaluation; and (3-5) Facilitating the learning of the migrant child using three techniques: "traditional" diagnosis and remediation, educational games, and Bereiter techniques. The latter two techniques are relatively innovative.

It should be noted at this point that halfway through the workshop, the second main Conference objective was modified. Whereas formerly it read:

> For educators concerned with the learning activities of migrant children, providing information on the salient characteristics of the learning styles of the migrant children taking part in the conference.

It was modified to state:

> For educators concerned with the learning activities of migrant children, providing an attitudinal set that much information about children is irrelevant in facilitating their learning; on the contrary, it is suggested that one powerful approach would be to diagnose the child's learning difficulties as he comes to you and implement the facilitation of learning cyclical model (diagnosis → objectives → developing activities → evaluating progress toward objectives).

In other words, teachers were asked to assume that the migrant child could learn, to approach the task of facilitating his learning systematically, and to expect the child to succeed. It was felt that a teacher too prone to find crutches for the migrant child — too quick to find reasons explaining why the child could not learn — too ready with reasons why he as a teacher could take responsibility off himself for facilitating the migrant's learning — might be serving an instrumental role in developing a permanent intellectual and social cripple. A better solution seemed to be one of providing the migrant child with learning strategies powerful enough to allow him to choose between viable life alternatives.

III. INTENDED AND ACTUAL CONFERENCE EVENTS

In this section is contained a detailed schedule of events. Next to those activities during which unexpected or unplanned happenings occurred (or an activity was cancelled or postponed), an explanation has been included and set off in brackets.

A. Events Prior to the Conference.

1. June 11 : Contract signed with the Department of Public Instruction.

2. June 11 - July 31 : Selection of participants, instructors, and consultant-instructors (see Appendix B).

3. June 11 - July 31 : Selection of instructional materials; materials chosen were:

    Bereiter, C., & Engelmann, S. *Teaching disadvantaged children in the preschool*. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1966.

    Cheyney, A. B. *Teaching culturally disadvantaged in the elementary school*. Columbus, Ohio: Merrill, 1967.

    Goodwin, W. L. (Ed.) *Bucknell conference: Learning problems of the migrant child*. Lewisburg, Pa.: Bucknell University, 1967.

    Otto, W., & McMenemy, R. A. *Corrective and remedial teaching: Principles and practices*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1966.

4. June 11 - July 31 : Preparation of an annotated bibliography (see Appendix C).

5. July 15 - 23 : Preparation of video tapes by Dr. William Heiner, Marlene Scardamalia, and Patricia Rugh on procedures to use when diagnosing reading difficulties using the *Durrell*; included taping of actual demonstration with migrant children.

6. August 2 : Mailing of Conference materials (including texts) and Prospectus to participants.

7. August 3 - 18 : Development of evaluation instruments (see Appendix F); arranging visits to migrant camps; and securing migrant children for the Conference.

B. Events During the Conference.

1. August 19 : 8:00 - 8:45 A. M. — Registration; distribution of Conference materials; campus orientation; etc.

2. August 19 : 8:45 - 10:00 A. M. — Introduction to Conference; administration of affective and cognitive pre-surveys (see Appendix F).

3. August 19 : 10:00 - 12 Noon — Orientation speakers:

   Mr. Dick Shatzer: Technician, Department of Labor, Pennsylvania Farm Labor Service.

   Reverend Charles C. Frazer: Director of Pennsylvania Migrant Ministry.

   Mr. John M. Hyams: Curriculum Development Specialist in Charge of Migrant Education Programs, Pennsylvania Department of Public Instruction.

   Sergeant David K. James: Pennsylvania State Police.

   [There was insufficient time allowed for questions from participants; see Event 17 scheduled on August 22 and Event 31 on August 28.]

4. August 19 : 1:00 - 5:00 P. M. — Orientation visits to migrant camps. Participants were formed into two groups and each group visited three camps; one camp was visited by both groups. At the conclusion of the visits, observations of participants were exchanged and discussed.

5. August 20 : 8:30 - 11:00 A. M. — Orientation films: "Harvest of Shame" and "The Migrant Education Story." After each film, participants discussed implications in small groups.

6. August 20 : 11:00 - 12 Noon — Facilitation of learning cycle lecture given to participants (Goodwin).

7. August 20 : 1:00 - 2:15 P. M. — Introduction to behavioral objectives and showing and discussion of filmstrips on "How to Prepare Behavioral Objectives" and "Types of Behavioral Objectives" (Cieslak).

[An additional planned filmstrip was not shown because of limited time.]

8. August 20 : 2:15 - 3:00 P. M. — Basic measurement concepts including validity and reliability (Goodwin).

9. August 20 : 3:00 - 4:30 P. M. — Introduction to using the Durrell Analysis of Reading Difficulty (Rugh and Scardamalia).

10. August 21 : 8:30 - 11:00 A. M. — Continuation of discussion on the Durrell, including showing the Phase I video tape of Durrell procedures.

[The Phase II Durrell video tape was not shown as initially planned as participants seemed satiated with principles and wanted to proceed with actual diagnosis using the Durrell.]

11. August 21 : 11:00 - 12 Noon — Orientation and get-acquainted session between participants and migrant children on campus.

12. August 21 : 1:00 - 4:30 P. M. — Participant administration of the Durrell to migrant children; video tape, peer, and monitor feedback; discussion between participants.

13. August 22 : 8:30 - 12 Noon — Participant participation in all four steps of Facilitation of Learning Cycle using migrant children.

14. August 22 : 1:00 - 2:15 P. M. — Participant reflection on Facilitation of Learning Cycle (including fishbowl of 8). Fishbowling is a technique to increase communication between groups. The usual procedure begins with several small groups in separate discussions. After some time of discussion, each group selects one or two "fish" who sit centrally with other so-selected persons; all others sit in a circle around the outside of this group and listen to the interaction which takes place. Many variations of this basic paradigm are possible.

15. August 22 : 2:15 - 3:30 P. M. — Cognitive survey on Facilitation of Learning Cycle and behavioral objectives administered to participants; feedback session conducted (tests scored via automatic grader).

[Diagnosis in mathematics postponed to August 23.]

16. August 22 : 3:30 - 4:00 P. M. — Orientation to video-tape equipment.

17. August 22 : 4:00 - 4:30 P. M. — Conference call used for participant question-and-answer session with Sergeant James.

18. August 23 : 8:30 - 11:00 A. M. — Introduction to diagnosis in mathematics: lecture and demonstration using migrant children (Dauber and Cieslak).

19. August 23 : 11:00 - 12 Noon — Cognitive survey on diagnosis in reading and mathematics administered to participants; feedback session conducted.

20. August 23 : 1:30 - 4:30 P. M. — Participant reflection on first week of the Conference culminating in fishbowl; staff reaction. This took place at the Timberhaven Conference Center in a retreat setting three miles south of Lewisburg.

[Game of Market postponed to August 26.]

21. August 23 : 4:30 - 6:00 P. M. — Evening repast and informal discussion of Conference.

22. August 26 : 8:30 - 9:00 A. M. — Review of Facilitation of Learning Model (Goodwin).

23. August 26 : 9:00 - 10:45 A. M. — The game of Market; participant reaction to same after playing (Carrescia).

24. August 26 : 10:45 - 11:30 A. M. — The game of Aqua-Math: description and demonstration using migrant children (Ermish).

25. August 26 : 11:30 - 12 Noon — General principles of game design (Baumgartner).

26. August 26 : 1:00 - 4:00 P. M. — Participants in small groups diagnose learning difficulties of children and design appropriate games.

27. August 27 : 8:30 - 11:00 A. M. — Continuation of game design and production sessions.

28. August 27 : 11:00 - 12 Noon — Display of both teacher-made and commercial games (Carrescia, Ille).

29. August 27 : 1:00 - 3:30 P. M. — Competition between participant groups using self-designed games with migrant children.

[Because of limited time, it was necessary to re-schedule the final stages of this competition on August 28.]

30. August 27 : 3:30 - 4:30 P. M. — Cognitive and affective surveys on educational games given to participants; feedback provided.

31. August 28 : 9:00 - 9:30 A. M. — Question-and-answer session with Mr. John Hyams.

32. August 28 : 9:30 - 10:15 A. M. — Rationale and recent developments related to Bereiter Technique; see Appendix D (Osborn).

33. August 28 : 10:15 -12 Noon — Demonstration of Bereiter Technique and discussion of resultant questions (Osborn).

    [Showing of Bereiter math film postponed to August 29.]

34. August 28 : 1:00 - 1:15 P. M. — Rationale for educational games (Goodwin).

35. August 28 : 1:15 - 3:00 P. M. — Games competition championship matches.

36. August 28 : 3:00 - 3:30 P. M. — Staff fishbowl to determine winners of competition.

37. August 29 : 9:00 - 10:00 A. M. — Bereiter math film and discussion (Rugh).

38. August 29 : 10:00 - 12 Noon — Participants in small groups engaged in applications of the Bereiter Technique with migrant children.

39. August 29 : 1:00 - 2:30 P. M. — Additional information on Bereiter Technique (Osborn).

40. August 29 : 2:30 - 3:00 P. M. — Cognitive survey on Bereiter Technique given to participants.

41. August 29 : 3:00 - 3:30 P. M. — Fishbowl of six participants on visits to migrant summer schools; six participants agreed to make the observational visits during the morning of August 29 (see Appendix E).

42. August 29 : 3:30 - 4:00 P. M.–Feedback on Bereiter Technique cognitive survey.

43. August 30 : 9:00 - 11:15 A. M. — Participants in small groups working with migrant children using Bereiter Technique supervised by Mrs. Osborn; administration of affective and cognitive surveys; administration of overall evaluation summary.

44. August 30 : 11:15 - 12 Noon — Feedback on cognitive survey.

45. August 30 : 1:30 - 4:00 P. M. — Participant reflection on entire Conference culminating in fishbowl; staff reaction.

46. August 30 : 4:00 - 5:30 P. M. — Evening repast and informal discussion of Conference.

C. Events After the Conference.

1. August 31 - October 31: Analyzing the questionnaire data.

2. August 31 - December 31: Editing and producing the migrant film of Conference activities.

3. September 27: Mailing of follow-up questionnaire to participants.

4. November 1 - February 28, 1969: Writing of final report on Conference.

IV. EVALUATION OF THE CONFERENCE

This section contains five main parts: first, the results of the affective surveys given to the participants are presented; second, the cognitive surveys given are similarly treated; third, the evaluation of the Conference activities as judged by the participants on the Overall Evaluation Summary is presented; fourth, participants' returns on a follow-up questionnaire are considered; and fifth, a section is presented which relates the evaluation results to the Conference objectives.

A. Results from Affective Surveys:

Two affective surveys were used in the Conference; both were given as pre- and post-instruments (although the overall affective survey was modified slightly from its pre-form before it was given as a post-instrument). The participants' attitudes towards educational games were measured before the instruction in that area and again after the instruction was completed (see Instrument 1 in Appendix F). Additionally, participants' attitudes in general towards the instruction of migrant children were measured (see Instruments 2a and 2b in Appendix F).

The affective items on educational games (Instrument 1) were scored as follows: on items 10-13, the response indicating the most favorable attitude was scored 4, and so forth with the least favorable response scored 0; on items 14-16, "yes" was scored 1 and "no" was scored 0; on item 14, "partially" was scored .5. In Table 1 results are indicated. As can be noted,

TABLE 1

Pre- and Post-Attitudes toward Educational Games

	Average Response	
	Pre-Survey	Post-Survey
Item 10	2.83	3.74
Item 11	3.48	3.61
Item 12	2.83	3.43
Item 13	3.65	3.91
Item 14	.91	.98
Item 15	.95	1.00
Item 16	.78	.94

attitudes were generally favorable to begin with and improved after the instructional activities. For example, on item 13, 8 participants did not check the most favorable response on the pre-survey, but this number was reduced to 2 on the post-survey. Personal feelings toward games, item 10, showed the most marked increase (2.83 to 3.74).

On the instrument designed to measure the overall affective impact of the Conference (Instruments 2a and 2b), items were scored as follows: the response indicating the most favorable attitude was scored 4, and so forth with the least favorable response being scored 0. The resultant average response on each item is indicated in Table 2. As can be noted in the table, changes from pre- to post-surveys were in a favorable direction in three cases and an unfavorable direction in one. The initial attitudes were generally quite favorable, however, leaving little room for improvement. The item on which responses underwent the greatest change was number 4, dealing with participants' self-confidence in helping migrant children to learn.

B. Results from Cognitive Surveys:

In all, six cognitive surveys (a total of 195 items) were administered to participants. The primary purpose of the surveys was to alert the instructional staff to those areas in which additional instruction was required; a secondary purpose was to ascertain the performance of the participants on the cognitive items.

TABLE 2

Pre- and Post-Attitudes toward Facilitating the Learning of Migrant Children

	Average Response	
	Pre-Survey	Post-Survey
Item 1	3.39	3.70
Item 2	3.30	3.65
Item 3	3.30	3.17
Item 4	1.43	2.17

Rather than report results from all six surveys, information is presented only on the two cognitive surveys given at the beginning and end of the Conference. The pre-survey (Instrument 3a, Appendix F) contained 30 multiple-choice items, 5 on each of six areas; the post-survey (Instruments 3a and 3b, Appendix F), contained the same 30 items plus an additional 30 items on the same six areas. The average number correct by subject area is reported in Table 3.

As can be noted in the table, post-survey performance nearly doubled that on the pre-survey for the 30 items that were repeated across the two tests. Performance on the 30 new items on the post-survey yielded few surprises; however, either the items on behavioral objectives (36-40) were more difficult than those on the other subjects or else participants had done less well at mastering the concepts in that subject area.

Individual performance on the 60-item post-survey varied from 38 to 57, with the average score being 48.09 as indicated in Table 3.

C. Results from Overall Evaluation Summary:

Instrument 4 in Appendix F, the Overall Summative Evaluation, was given to all participants on the last day of the Conference. Participants were encouraged to be candid in their replies; there was no discussion or surveillance made of the completed questionnaires as they were finished. The purpose of the instrument was to give

TABLE 3

Average Raw Score on Pre- and Post-Cognitive Surveys

	Average Number Right	
	Pre-Survey	Post-Survey
General Diagnosis (1-5)	2.52	4.57
Behavioral Objectives (6-10)	2.57	4.87
Reading Diagnosis (11-15)	1.48	4.61
Math Diagnosis (16-20)	3.35	4.43
Educational Games (21-25)	2.48	4.39
Bereiter Technique (26-30)	2.17	3.91
Average Score	14.57	26.78
General Diagnosis (31-35)	—	4.00
Behavioral Objectives (36-40)	—	1.91
Reading Diagnosis (41-45)	—	3.96
Math Diagnosis (46-50)	—	3.70
Educational Games (51-55)	—	3.87
Bereiter Techniques (56-60)	—	3.87
Average Score		48.09

each participant an opportunity to react to all facets and activities of the Conference.

For the purpose of analysis, qualitative statements were converted to a numerical rating. This was accomplished by converting to a 4-point scale: four indicating Definitely Yes; three, Probably Yes; two, No Opinion; one, Probably No; and zero, Definitely No.

The responses are summarized below, item by item, for each section:

INITIAL SECTION

Items 1 and 2.

On these items, it was determined that the participants felt that their expectations for the Conference were quite well met. In fact, a portion of each participant's expectations was met through the two weeks, although expectations varied. The majority of the expectations were to:

(a) Gain materials to facilitate the learning of the migrant child.

(b) Gain insight into the learning capabilities of the migrant.

(c) Understand the migrant, his life and unique problems, in order to facilitate his learning.

(d) Share ideas, opinions, and experiences with other teachers and educators.

Item 3.

The diversity of things listed in response to this item defied analysis. Some were concerned with practical applications of the materials and techniques incorporated into the Conference, others were philosophical, and others quite insightful. On the average, two ideas were listed per participant.

SECTION A: Physical Accommodations.

Item 1.

The four participants (16%) who used the dormitory facilities rated them as excellent. Sixty-seven percent of the participants rated the cafeteria facilities excellent, 24 percent good, and 9 percent average. All participants who stayed on campus felt a great deal was gained from this experience. They suggested that all participants should consider this for future conferences.

Item 2.

All participants were satisfied with the amount of information sent to them before the Conference concerning room, board, and recreational facilities.

SECTION B: Materials.

Item 1.

All participants except one felt that it definitely was a good idea to distribute the materials to participants before the Conference began; the lone holdout felt that it probably was a good idea. On the average, participants received their books 10 days before the Conference began.

Item 2.

About two-thirds of the participants felt that they would have done more reading before the Conference began if they had received their materials earlier. Seven of the twenty-three participants realized before the Conference began that they had not received their materials in time while nine others discovered this after the first day of the Conference. The remaining seven did not answer this item.

Item 3.

Thirteen percent made use of the annotated bibliography before the Conference, while 87 percent made no use of it. Thirteen percent of the 87 percent making no use of it, however, indicated that they planned to use it in finding references after the Conference.

Item 4.

In Table 4, it is indicated that of the four books, Bereiter and Otto were found to be very useful, Cheyney moderately useful, while the State Plan was rated somewhat below moderately useful. One participant did not rate Cheyney's book and two did not rate Otto's book. Compared to the 1967 Conference, the 1968 rating of Otto was up while the other ratings were approximately unchanged. Before the Conference began, the books had been rated approximately as they had been in 1967 (see Table 5).

TABLE 4

Participants' General Opinions of Texts Used in the Conference

Book	Number of Participants Selecting Each Ratings of Usefulness				
	Very	Moderately	Little	Not at All	Not Read
Bereiter	12	9	2	0	0
Cheyney	8	9	2	0	3
Otto	13	7	1	0	0
State Plan	5	9	6	2	1
Totals	38	34	11	2	4

TABLE 5

Participants' General Opinions of Texts Used in the Conference

(Ratings made before Conference began)

Book	Number of Participants Selecting Each Ratings				
	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor	Not Read
Bereiter	7	6	2	0	6
Cheyney	5	8	2	0	6
Otto	2	1	4	0	10
State Plan	2	8	7	0	5
Totals	16	23	15	0	27

Item 5.

All of the participants did additional reading in the books during the two weeks of the Conference. The average number of hours spent on each book was: 3.4 on Bereiter, 1.1 on Cheyney, 3.9 on Otto, and .9 on the State Plan. Before the Conference began, the reported reading times for each book were: Bereiter, 1.8 hours; Cheyney, 1.6 hours; Otto, .6 hours; and State Plan, .9 hours. These figures and others are given in Table 6. Compared to the 1967 Conference, the 1968 pre-reading figures were strikingly similar, while about three hours more reading occurred during the 1968 Conference, easily explained by the longer duration of the second conference.

Item 6.

Table 7 is relevant; the average rankings (on a scale from one to four, one being the highest) of the four sources on all three criteria — most interesting, most thought provoking, and most relevant to the concerns of the Conference-are given. The Bereiter book was rated highest overall, with Otto second, Cheyney third, and the State Plan last.

Item 7.

Ninety-five percent of the participants felt that all of the sources should have been included; 5 percent had no opinion.

Item 8.

Eighty-seven percent of the participants listed no additional reading materials as relevant for participants. The 13 percent

TABLE 6

Hours Spent Reading Conference Materials,
by Total and Average Per Participant

Book	Total Hours Spent Reading			Average Hours Per Participant		
	Prior to Conference	During Conference	Overall	Prior to Conference	During Conference	Overall
Bereiter	42.3	78.3	120.6	1.8	3.4	5.2
Cheyney	35.8	25.2	61.0	1.6	1.1	2.7
Otto	14.8	89.6	104.4	.6	3.9	4.5
State Plan	21.5	20.9	42.4	.9	.9	1.8
Totals	114.4	214.0	328.4	4.9	9.3	14.2

TABLE 7

Average Participants' Rankings of Conference Texts on Three Criteria

Book	Average Ranking of Each Book			
	Most Interesting	Most Thought Provoking	Most Relevant to Conference	Overall Ranking
Bereiter	1.65	1.48	1.62	1.58
Cheyney	2.82	2.66	3.00	2.83
Otto	1.88	2.12	1.69	1.90
State Plan	3.65	3.76	3.67	3.69

that did suggested the following additional materials: Revolution in learning by Maya Pines; A history of the american negro; Negro self concept; Death at an early age; Taxonomy of educational objectives, Handbook I, Cognitive domain, edited by Benjamin Bloom; and Preparing instructional objectives by Robert Mager.

SECTION C: Structure and Content of the Conference.

Item 1.

Fifty percent of the participants rated the choice of activities for the Conference excellent, and 50 percent rated the choice good.

Item 2.

Table 8 is relevant. The four guest speakers were ranked on a scale in terms of the most interesting, and the most relevant to the Conference. John Hyams from the DPI was ranked highest in both cases.

Item 3.

Four percent definitely felt the guest speakers had ample time to present their ideas, 17 percent responded probably, 30 percent probably not, and 49 percent felt they definitely did not have enough time to present their ideas. Most comments agreed that Reverend Frazer, the last speaker, was not allowed enough time.

TABLE 8

Participants' Opinions of the Guest Speakers' Presentations at the Conference

Criterion	Average Ranking of Each Speaker			
	Rev. Charles C. Frazer Migrant Ministry	Mr. Richard Shatzer Farm Labor Service	Mr. John M. Hyams DPI	Sgt. James Penna. State Police
Most interesting	2.37	3.77	1.77	2.09
Contribution to Conference objectives	2.50	3.60	1.65	2.20

Item 4.

Six participants, or 26 percent, called Sergeant James on a conference telephone to ask him additional questions. All but one of these participants felt the conference phone was sufficient to meet their need for additional information.

Item 5.

Sixty-five percent felt the visits to migrant camps were definitely beneficial, 17 percent probably beneficial, 5 percent had no opinion, 9 percent responded probably not beneficial, and 5 percent felt the visits were definitely not beneficial.

Item 6.

The film "Harvest of Shame," which was shown Tuesday of the first week, was of definite interest to 87 percent of the participants, probably interesting to 4 percent and probably not interesting to 9 percent. Sixty-one percent felt it was definitely presented at an appropriate time, 22 percent probably yes, 13 percent no opinion, and 4 percent did not respond to this item.

Item 7.

Forty-three percent felt that the film "The Migrant Education Story," (presented after the "Harvest of Shame" film) was definitely interesting, 43 percent probably yes, and 14 percent had no opinion. Most comments suggested that this film was either too good to be true, or that it showed a great deal could be done to facilitate the learning of the migrant child. Forty-three percent definitely thought the film was presented at an appropriate time, 35 percent felt it probably was, and 22 percent had no opinion.

Item 8.

Seventy-four percent thought the filmstrips on behavioral objectives were definitely helpful, 9 percent probably helpful, and 17 percent had no opinion.

Item 9.

Thirty-four percent felt the introduction to the _Durrell Analysis of Reading Difficulty_ was definitely adequate, 52 percent probably adequate, and 13 percent felt it was probably not adequate.

Item 10.

Forty-eight percent of the participants felt the videotaped introduction to the _Durrell_ was definitely adequate, 39 percent probably adequate, 9 percent had no opinion, and 4 percent felt it was probably not adequate. However, the comments indicated that 83 percent felt that the tape was too long.

Item 11.

Sixty-five percent of the participants agreed that they were not allowed ample time in working directly with the migrant children on diagnosing reading problems. The remaining 35 percent felt they were given ample time.

Item 12.

Forty-eight percent definitely benefited from the live demonstrations in mathematics diagnosis, 17 percent probably benefited, 17 percent had no opinion, 4 percent probably did not benefit, and 14 percent did not respond to this item.

Item 13.

Forty-eight percent were definitely not bored at any time with the lecture material, 13 percent probably not, 9 percent had no opinion, 22 percent were probably bored, and 8 percent definitely bored at some time. Eighty percent of the comments made were directed toward the Durrell video tape which, because of the length of the introduction, was listed as the major cause for boredom.

Item 14.

Eighty-three percent definitely felt the rotational sequence (through diagnosis, behavioral objectives, activities, and evaluation) was effective, 13 percent probably effective, and 4 percent had no opinion.

Item 15.

Seventy percent felt the fishbowl method of discussion/evaluation/feedback had definite merit, 22 percent probably had merit, 4 percent had no opinion, and 4 percent felt it definitely had no merit.

Item 16.

It was indicated by 35 percent that video recording was definitely helpful in providing feedback, 43 percent probably helpful, and 22 percent had no opinion. Those who had no opinion usually were not given the chance to evaluate themselves in a play-back session.

Item 17.

Twenty-six percent felt that video taping was definitely not a deterrent factor while diagnosing, 35 percent felt it probably was not, 9 percent had no opinion, 26 percent said it probably was, and 4 percent felt it definitely was a deterrent factor.

Item 18.

Forty percent felt it was definitely a good idea to have cognitive surveys after instruction in each area was completed, 52 percent probably yes, 4 percent had no opinion, and 4 percent said it was probably not a good idea. The majority of the participants liked the idea of finding out what they should learn and had learned.

Item 19.

The experience with video-tape recorders was deemed definitely valuable by 43 percent, probably valuable by 35 percent, probably not by 9 percent, and 13 percent had no opinion.

Item 20.

Twenty-six percent felt their experience with the technical nature of video-tape recorders was valuable, 13 percent probably, 52 percent had no opinion, and 9 percent definitely did not find value in this experience. The 52 percent who had no opinion were primarily those participants who did not have a chance to operate the video-tape recorders.

Item 21.

The feedback capabilities of the video-tape recorder were definitely of value to 74 percent of the participants, probably valuable to 13 percent, and the remaining 13 percent had no opinion.

Item 22.

Twenty-six percent felt they were definitely too rushed or pressured at some time during the Conference, 30 percent probably yes, 4 percent had no opinion, 17 percent probably not, 17 percent definitely not, and 4 percent did not respond to this item. The comments indicated that all of those who were too pressured, felt so only at times during the first week, and 85 percent of these specified that they felt pressured while diagnosing children.

Item 23.

Fifty-seven percent of the participants felt the reflection at Timberhaven on the first Friday (August 23) was definitely a valuable part of the Conference, 17 percent probably yes, 22 percent had no opinion, and 4 percent felt it probably was not valuable.

Item 24.

The playing of the game of Market definitely served as an appropriate starting point for 48 percent, probably did for 39 percent, 9 percent had no opinion (half of this percentage represents absentees), and 4 percent probably did not.

Item 25.

Sixty-one percent felt the Aqua Math game demonstration was definitely effective, 30 percent probably yes, and 9 percent had no opinion (half of this percentage represents absentees).

Item 26.

Sixty-one percent felt the rotational sequence (conducting diagnosis, setting objectives, designing a game, playing and evaluating the game) was definitely effective in understanding the role of games in learning, 30 percent probably yes, 4 percent had no opinion, and 4 percent did not respond to this item.

Item 27.

Sixty-one percent felt designing their own game was definitely helpful, 35 percent probably helpful, and 4 percent did not respond (absent).

Item 28.

Thirty-nine percent felt the competition among participants definitely added something to the Conference, 4 percent felt it probably did, 17 percent had no opinion, 22 percent felt it did not, 13 percent felt it definitely did not, while 1 person did not respond (absent).

Item 29.

Thirty percent felt the judgment of the games competition was definitely adequate, 17 percent probably yes, 26 percent had no opinion, 13 percent probably not, 9 percent definitely not, and 4 percent did not respond to this item (absent).

Item 30.

Seventy percent definitely planned to use games in the classroom, 17 percent responded probably yes, 9 percent had no opinion, and 4 percent did not respond.

Item 31.

Do you feel games are appropriate for migrant children (i.e. of all ages)? Fifty-two percent answered definitely yes, 39 percent probably yes, 4 percent had no opinion, and 4 percent replied probably no.

Item 32.

Seventy-four percent definitely considered games effective in motivating migrant children, 22 percent said probably yes, and 4 percent felt probably no.

Item 33.

Thirteen percent definitely felt there were certain types of educational games that were more appropriate for migrant children, 43 percent probably yes, 35 percent had no opinion, and 9 percent probably no.

Item 34.

Forty-eight percent felt the question-answer session the second week with John Hyams was definitely helpful, 13 percent probably helpful, 26 percent had no opinion (9 percent of which were absent), 9 percent felt probably not helpful, and 4 percent did not respond to this item (absent).

Item 35.

The first lecture by Jean Osborn on the rationale and methodology of the Bereiter Technique was definitely helpful to 65 percent, probably helpful to 26 percent, 4 percent had no opinion, and 4 percent did not resond to this item (absent).

Item 36.

Seventy-four percent felt Mrs. Osborn's demonstration with the six migrant children was very effective, 13 percent effective, and 13 percent had no opinion (9 percent of which were absent).

Item 37.

Was it a meaningful experience for you to watch migrant children play educational games? Sixty-five percent responded definitely yes, 22 percent probably yes, 4 percent had no opinion, and 9 percent probably no.

Item 38.

The film on Bereiter mathematics techniques was of definite interest to 87 percent, probably interesting to 9 percent, and

4 percent did not respond. Forty-eight percent definitely felt the film was presented at an appropriate time, 39 percent felt probably yes, 9 percent had no opinion, and 4 percent did not respond to this item.

Item 39.

Was the opportunity for you to apply the Bereiter Technique meaningful to you? Sixty-one percent definitely yes, 30 percent probably yes, and 9 percent had no opinion.

Item 40.

The fishbowl on the migrant school visit (Thursday afternoon of the second week) was definitely meaningful to 35 percent of the participants (3 of the 8 who responded definitely meaningful were in the fishbowl), 22 percent probably meaningful, 30 percent had no opinion, and 13 percent did not respond to this item.

Item 41.

The techniques provided for rapid feedback after the cognitive surveys were definitely helpful to 74 percent, probably helpful to 22 percent, and 4 percent had no opinion.

Item 42.

Forty-eight percent felt they definitely had a voice in determining the types of activities in the workshop, 35 percent probably did, and 17 percent had no opinion.

Item 43.

Ninety-six percent felt the staff was definitely appropriate for the workshop, and 4 percent had no opinion; the comment from this response stated that this participant did not feel qualified to judge.

Item 44.

Thirty-nine percent recommended no changes in staffing a similar conference in subsequent years. The other 61 percent of the participants left the item blank.

Item 45.

Twenty-six percent felt the class days were definitely of appropriate length, 39 percent felt they probably were, 17 percent had no opinion, 4 percent felt they probably were not, 9 percent felt they definitely were not, and 4 percent did not respond to this item.

Item 46.

Fifty-two percent of the participants did not list activities that they felt were inappropriate, half of them were satisfied or could think of none, while the other half did not respond at all. There was an average of two activities per person who listed such items. Beginning with the least appropriate, the most frequently mentioned activities were ranked as follows:

(1) Games competition.
(2) Video tape of Durrell.
(3) Lecture on correlation and validity.

Item 47.

The participants were asked to list the five activities which they considered the most important. Thirteen percent did not respond to this item. There was an average of 4.3 responses to this item from those who did respond. On a five point scale, the most favored activity was the Durrell Reading Test, its application and understanding; second was Mrs. Osborn's lecture, demonstration, and the participants' involvement with the Bereiter Technique; third, the Learning Cyclical Model; fourth, working directly with the children; and fifth, the live demonstrations with the children. Other activities rated quite high were the visits to migrant camps, the evaluations/fishbowls at Timberhaven, games, and the guest lecturers.

Item 48.

The overall impressions of the Learning Cyclical Model were very favorable. Everyone agreed that this was a good model to follow.

Item 49.

The Facilitation of Learning Cyclical Model definitely assisted 61 percent of the participants in seeing how various aspects of the Conference were interrelated, probably assisted 9 percent, 26 percent had no opinion, and 4 percent did not respond to this item.

Item 50.

Ninety-one percent of the participants would definitely be willing to attend a similar conference next summer that dealt with (at a higher level) facilitating the learning of migrant children, 4 percent had no opinion, and 4 percent probably would not.

Item 51.

In general overall opinions of the Conference, 70 percent thought it was very effective, and 30 percent felt it was effective.

Item 52.

Seventy percent believed they would definitely change some of the behaviors they had used in the past as a result of this two-week workshop experience, 22 percent thought they probably would, 4 percent had no opinion, and 4 percent felt they probably would not.

D. Results from Follow-up Questionnaire to Participants:

At the end of September, 1968, four weeks after the Conference had concluded and after participating teachers were familiar with their new classes, a follow-up questionnaire was sent to them by mail. The instrument contained only five items (see Instrument 5, Appendix F). All participants responded; the summary of their responses for each item is given below.

Item 1.

Ten of the 24 participants (42 percent) responded that they had been involved in some way with the education of migrant children; 13, or 54 percent, answered that they had not been involved, and the remaining person (4 percent) was involved indirectly.

Eight of the 10 who responded in the affirmative to this question averaged 4.25 migrant students each, but this figure includes one administrator who was involved with the education of 18 migrant children. Not including the administrator, the average drops to about two migrant children per teacher.

Item 2.

Ten of the participants (42 percent) have had contact with other educators on matters concerning migrant children. Eight of the 10 initiated the contacts themselves, one felt it was a mutual concern, and the remaining one did not initiate the contact. From 7 responses, there was an average of 2.85 contacts on matters concerning migrant children.

Item 3.

Two-thirds of the participants were involved with the education of disadvantaged learners other than migrant children, 29 percent (7) were not involved with the education of the disadvantaged learners, and the remaining person (4 percent) did not respond. From the 11 numerical answers, each was involved with an average of 64.36 disadvantaged learners, one response from an administrator included in the average was 500; not included in the average were two responses of many and one question mark. The average of 64.36 dropped to 20.8 when the 500 response was not included.

Item 4.

On a four-point scale, 4 being the highest assigned to a "definitely yes" response, these are the averages of the following categories to the question: Did you find yourself doing anything different (and in your opinion better) as a result of your involvement in the Migrant Conference?:

(a) For migrant children only: 3.1 from responses of 10 participants.
(b) For other disadvantaged learners only: from a total of 17 responses, the average was 3.29.
(c) For all other pupils: 20 participants responded averaging 3.25.

So, in each case, the average response indicated "probably Yes."

Item 5.

On the same four-point scale, the participants rated the Migrant Conference as a definitely valuable learning experience for them (they had been in the classroom for a month at the time of this response). The 24 participants averaged 3.87.

E. Evaluation Results as Related to Objectives.

An attempt will be made in this section to relate succinctly the results of the participants' evaluations and actual activities to the attainment of the general Conference objectives specified in Section II. The objectives could perhaps be separated into two interrelated classifications: (1) operational objectives which determined to some degree the structure and activities of the Conference; and (2) objectives which focused upon intended changes among the participants' attitudes and teaching skills, not only as related to migrant children but also to a general, conceptual scheme of effective, instruction decision making.

One of the primary operational Conference objectives was to maximize the involvement of the participants with migrant children. It is felt that this objective was achieved to a large degree. For example, children were transported from two moderate size migrant camps in the Region to a classroom on campus during 8 days of the 10-day Conference. The ages of the children ranged from 4 to 12 years, and the daily attendance varied from 10 to 15. The general format of the classroom was oriented toward individual enrichment activities such as painting, play, and educational games to permit a minimum of disruption as students frequently left the classroom to work primarily in a one-to-one relationship with the Conference participants. (The reader is referred to Section III for the exact activities involving migrant children and participants.)

It is perhaps significant that when the participants were asked to list the five Conference activities which they considered most important (Item 47, Section IV C), the first three listed contained a large degree of interaction between the children and participants, the fourth ranked item was specifically stated as working with the children, and the fifth ranked item was live demonstrations utilizing children. Thus, there is a conspicuous absence of any activity which did not directly involve children.

Another operational objective was to provide feedback to the participants from many sources to help them further develop their teaching skills. The activities related to the achievement of this objective included the use of video-tape equipment, evaluation and comments of colleagues, staff members' reactions and observations, rapid return of test results and the fishbowl method of discussion.

It was felt by the staff that the use of video-tape equipment would be an especially effective method of providing formative information to the participants. Although some people were not able to view and critique all of their video tapes, primarily because of a "tight" schedule, the feedback capabilities of the video tape-recorder were definitely thought to have been of value by 74 percent of the participants, probably of value by 13 percent, and the remaining 13 percent had no opinion.

On the basis of the various feedback activities listed and the participants' reactions to them, it is felt that this objective was met to a large degree. Perhaps the ultimate criterion of the degree to which the staff successfully attained this objective is found in Item 22, Section IV C: 70 percent of the participants believed they would definitely change some of the behaviors which they had used in the past, 22 percent thought they probably would, 4 percent had no opinion, and 4 percent felt they probably would not.

Another objective of the Conference was to train the participants to operate within a format of systematic instruction decision making. The Facilitation of Learning Model (see Appendix A) was introduced early in the Conference to serve this function. The participants were given numerous opportunities to operate within the system that the model represented. The model also functioned to interrelate the various aspects of the Conference and to focus them on the ultimate objective of facilitating the learning of the student.

In addition, participants became acquainted with several methods of facilitating learning which were classified as Traditional, Educational Games, and the Bereiter Technique. The reactions of the participants in the Overall Evaluation Summary indicate, in general, that they thought that the experiences were worthwhile. Furthermore, the participants' average scores on a cognitive survey approximately doubled from the pre- to the post-test.

Finally, implicit within the entire structure of the Conference was the attempt by the staff and consultants to develop among the participants positive assurance of their ability to work effectively with migrant children. The results reported in Table 2, Section IV A, tend to indicate that initially the participants had relatively positive attitudes towards the possibility of developing instructional techniques and materials for migrant children (3.39), but they were less confident to a larger degree about being able to actually facilitate the learning of the migrant child as compared to their "regular" classroom pupil (1.43). After the Conference, the participants thought it more possible to develop instructional techniques and materials (3.70) but (perhaps more significant) they felt, as a whole, that they were now equally confident about working with the migrant child and their regular pupils (2.17).

In summary, it is felt that the staff had achieved their objectives to a large degree although it is uncertain what long-range effect, if any, would accrue. Also, a certain amount of the success of the Conference might be attributed to the flexibility which was maintained throughout the program.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS

Presented below are five recommendations which reflect considerations from the two migrant conferences. They have been grouped under three main headings: relating to the training of teachers; relating to educational programs for migrant children; and relating to the allocation of resources for programs in this general area.

It should be noted that consideration is not given in this section to a number of secondary recommendations which could be made, particularly recommendations relevant to conducting in-service programs for teachers of migrant children. It is felt that the previous section fairly well documents what occurred and that any recommendations that may have been forthcoming are fairly explicit in the material presented there.

In regards to the training of teachers to facilitate the learning of children of migrant agricultural workers, it is recommended:

I. THAT THE NUMBER OF DIRECT CONTACTS BETWEEN PARTICIPATING TEACHERS (IN TRAINING) AND MIGRANT CHILDREN BE INCREASED.

This recommendation is made for three reasons. First, the instructional staff was uniformly in agreement that the direct experience with the migrant children was of extreme value to the participants. Second, the reactions of the participants themselves to working directly with migrant children in developing teaching techniques were consistently favorable. Third, it was felt that attitudes of the type expressed in the quote below, made by one of the participants at a reflection fishbowl, might be fairly prevalent among educators:

> I'd like to mention something, and I think we all feel this way. We've taken a first step in overcoming a fear of the black race which we all have pretty well built in us. I think for most of us, this is the first time we've ever taken a black child by the hand or put our arm around a black child. This is probably one of the few groups in Pennsylvania that are together today that can all say we've led a black child. This is the beginning of overcoming a fear, a fear that has to be overcome if we are ever to overcome the prejudice that exists in the United States today.

It seemed to some of the Conference staff that this was a difficult statement for the participant to make and probably represents a honest feeling held by himself as well as other participants. To the extent that this is true, the direct contact between teachers and migrant children is seen as essential.

II. THAT NEW TECHNOLOGY, PARTICULARLY VIDEO TAPE, BE EXPLORED IN THE TRAINING OF TEACHERS.

This recommendation is made because of the belief that the extremely difficult process of teacher change (which in-service work seems to be about) is speeded up by increasing the number and types of feedback available to the teacher. Video tape serves this function well.

In regards to programs for the education of the children of migrant agricultural workers, it is recommended:

III. THAT IMAGINATIVE NEW PROGRAMS BE TRIED OUT ON AN EXPLORATORY BASIS.

This recommendation is made in light of the several imaginative programs suggested by consultants at the 1967 Conference (see the papers presented at that Conference in Learning problems of the migrant child).

For example, consider the dramatic discontinuity of the migrant child's educational experience. Continuity might be enhanced by migrants periodically undertaking individualized instruction by computer (with its infallible memory for lessons last covered); this might truly offer good promise of success, as pointed out by Dr. McLean. Certainly, computers offer several advantages over various transfer of record systems that have been established. Records were requested from the Florida Department of Education on migrant students in the 1968 Conference, but the few records subsequently obtained (only for 40 percent of the pupils) were skimpy and of little value. A computer which could store information indicating exactly the point at which the migrant child should continue his instructional work offers obvious advantages.

IV. THAT THE MERIT OF SUMMER SCHOOLS FOR MIGRANT CHILDREN, AS SEPARATE FROM "REGULAR" FALL SCHOOLS, BE CHALLENGED.

This recommendation is made for two reasons. As is apparent in Appendix E, the caliber of the summer school sessions conducted for migrant children is variable and in many cases, undoubtedly quite low. The cost, nonetheless, is high but the outcomes of such programs are profoundly uncertain.

Second, and more important, discontinuity normally results when the migrant child must move from the summer school to the regular fall school program. If at all possible, it is strongly recommended that the summer and fall school experience of the migrant child be as highly coordinated as possible. In the same vein, it is suggested that there may be considerable merit in grouping migrant children for their instruction in academic subjects in the fall, even though this practice might not always meet the criterion of integrated instruction.

In regards to the allocation of resources for programs directed at the children of migrant agricultural workers, it is recommended:

V. THAT CONTINUING ATTENTION BE GIVEN TO THE PROBLEM THAT MANY OF THE FUNDS ARE NOT HAVING EXTENSIVE AND/OR DIRECT IMPACT ON THE PUPILS INTENDED.

This recommendation is made on the basis of two facts. In the first case, the number of migrant children attending the relatively expensive summer schools established for them has tended to be small; thus the cost of this instruction is very high.

In the second case, regarding in-service programs for teachers such as the one at Bucknell, it is obvious from our participant follow-up (see Section IV, D) that the number of children directly affected by teachers so trained is disappointly small. For example, the average number of migrant children directly involved with each teacher (at the workshop) was only two. Additionally, half of the participants had no contact at all with other educators concerning migrant children.

It is not easy to identify programs which might have a more direct impact on this category of youngsters, but the search for highly relevant programs should continue. Again, the 1967 Conference booklet (Learning problems of the migrant child) contains several unique program ideas.

APPENDICES

Page

APPENDIX A: The Facilitation of Learning Model. 57

APPENDIX B: Participants and Staff. 59

APPENDIX C: An Annotated Bibliography on the Education of the Migrant Child. 63

APPENDIX D: Lecture by Jean Osborn. 88

APPENDIX E: Fishbowl of Six Participants on School Visits 102

APPENDIX F: Evaluation Instruments. 111

APPENDIX A

THE FACILITATION OF LEARNING MODEL

What does the word "teacher" mean to you? When hearing this word, many people imagine a person standing in front of his class pouring knowledge into children. The teacher is active and the children passive. Learning must be an active involvement process for the student; teaching at its best is really the facilitation of student learning. Ideally the teacher is a "facilitator of learning."

How does a teacher facilitate learning? He must first determine or diagnose his students' strengths and weaknesses. If a child already knows how to spell the week's spelling words, we do not want to spend time "reteaching" them to him. On the other hand, if he cannot use his multiplication tables, we must find ways for him to develop and practice this skill. The tests at the beginning of each unit of study in the Conference will attempt to diagnose the level of your knowledge about the various aspects of the facilitation of learning model. If you demonstrate a lack of knowledge, we will encourage you to read and study certain specified material. If you already seem to understand this material, however, we will suggest that you spend time in other, more constructive ways.

In the second step of the facilitation of learning model, a teacher must establish learning objectives for pupils. Some of these will be general; others will be specific, and these often will be stated in behavioral terms. The behavioral objective we established in relation to the final Conference exam can be stated as follows: "Given the 60-item cognitive test at the end of the Conference and without the aid of reference materials, the participant will be able to answer at least 80 percent of the questions correctly."

Having established behavioral objectives, a teacher is now ready to undertake the third process in the model, namely, to develop or select a learning activity. Any activity which helps the student to reach the established objectives can be considered an appropriate learning activity; some activities are obviously more effective and efficient than others.

As a fourth and final step in the model, a teacher needs to evaluate the learning of his students. Often the teacher may simply ask the student to perform according to the behavioral objective. We will give you a 60-item test at the end of this Conference and hope that you will answer at least 48 questions correctly.

In a larger sense, evaluation relates to (1) rediagnosing pupil strengths and weaknesses, (2) determining whether learning objectives for pupils have been reached, and (3) ascertaining whether the learning activity might be modified and improved (or even replaced). This being the case, the cyclical nature of the facilitation of learning model is apparent.

APPENDIX B

PARTICIPANTS AND STAFF

BUCKNELL CONFERENCE ON FACILITATING THE LEARNING OF THE MIGRANT CHILD

August 19-30, 1968

Participant	School District	Position
Mr. Theodore J. Andrewlevich 1148 Market Street Sunbury, Penna. 17801	Shikellamy	Head Teacher
Mr. Randall W. Arbogast 123 South Third Street Lewisburg, Penna. 17837	Lewisburg	Building Principal
Mr. Paul W. Bower 428 Market Street Mifflinburg, Penna. 17844	Mifflinburg	Assistant Elementary Supervisor
Mr. Frank A. Casale 1525 Chestnut Street Williamsport, Penna. 17701	East Lycoming	Teacher
Mrs. Helen E. Ditty R. D. #3 Sunbury, Penna. 17801	Line Mountain	Teacher
Mr. Thomas L. Dunkin, Jr. 1208 W. Arch Street Shamokin, Penna. 17872	Shamokin	Teacher
Mrs. Rita S. Eyerly 327 East Street Bloomsburg, Penna. 17815	Bloomsburg	Teacher
Mr. James B. Finn 425 Orange Street Selinsgrove, Penna. 17870	Snyder County Schools	Assistant County Superintendent
Mr. Carl A. Fisher, Jr. R. D. #3 Sunbury, Penna. 17801	Line Mountain	Teacher
Mr. Glenn L. Henninger R. D. #1, Box 302A Paxinos, Penna. 17860	Shamokin	Speech Therapist
Mrs. H. Belle Himes 2939 Old Berwick Road Bloomsburg, Penna. 17815	Danville	Teacher

Participants	School District	Position
Mrs. Dora J. Jarrett 401 Gearhart Street Riverside, Penna. 17868	Danville	Teacher
Miss Betty Lou Kepner 225 1/2 Arch Street Sunbury, Penna. 17801	Shikellamy	Teacher
Mrs. Judith A. Keyes R. D. #1 Selinsgrove, Penna. 17870	Line Mountain	Teacher
Mr. Albert L. Klinger 149 Catawissa Avenue Sunbury, Penna. 17801	Shikellamy	Teacher
Mr. Leonard G. Lawrence 204 W. Independence Street Selinsgrove, Penna. 17870	Selinsgrove	Teacher
Mrs. Sally R. Leonard 60 South Seventh Street Lewisburg, Penna. 17837	Not Applicable	Participant/ Observer
Mr. Daniel Paulnock, Jr. 337 Market Street Sunbury, Penna. 17801	Warrior Run	Head Teacher
Mrs. Pauline H. Peters 415 Green Street Mifflinburg, Penna. 17844	Lewisburg	Teacher
Mr. Ben R. Pollock, II 600 East Second Street Bloomsburg, Penna. 17815	Danville	Teacher
Mr. James J. Rutkowski 204 W. Independence Street Selinsgrove, Penna. 17870	Selinsgrove	Teacher
Mr. Andrew Soback 110 S. Mercer Street Berwick, Penna. 18603	Berwick	Teacher
Mrs. Phyllis E. Unger 1120 Packer Street Sunbury, Penna. 17801	Shikellamy	Teacher
Mr. Nelson G. Wilcox R. D. #3 Muncy, Penna. 17756	Jersey Shore	Building Principal

CONFERENCE STAFF

Dr. William L. Goodwin,
Coordinator

Mr. Paul J. Cieslak,
Assistant Coordinator (Administration)

Miss Patricia A. Rugh,
Conference Assistant (Instruction)

Miss Marlene L. Scardamalia,
Conference Assistant (Instruction)

Miss Mary Ezell,
Conference Assistant (Instruction)

Mr. Irvin R. Rubincam,
Assistant Coordinator (Media)

- Mr. William Aydelott,
  16 mm Film Photographer
- Mr. Charles DeVoe,
  16 mm Film Sound Man
- Miss Jean DeVoe,
  16 mm Film Editor and Photo Stylist
- Mr. Robert Dunkerly,
  Video Recording and Audio-Sound Man

Miss Donna Derr and Mrs. Marilyn (Walter) Lee,
Conference Secretaries

Mrs. Sally Leonard,
Participant-Observer

Instructional Consultant: Mrs. Katherine Dauber

Mrs. Dauber is the coordinator of early school activities in the West Shore School District in Pennsylvania. She has had extensive experience with kindergarten children and teachers and has served as a consultant on kindergarten education for the Pennsylvania Department of Public Instruction.

Instructional Consultant: Mrs. Jean Osborn

Mrs. Osborn is the Head Teacher of the Bereiter-Engelmann experimental preschool at the University of Illinois. Mrs. Osborn has had extensive experience teaching disadvantaged children and also served as a consultant to last year's Conference on the Learning Problems of the Migrant Child held at Bucknell University.

APPENDIX C

AN ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY ON THE EDUCATION OF THE MIGRANT CHILD

This bibliography was originally prepared for the 1967 Bucknell Conference; it has been updated by the inclusion of 20 additional references for the 1968 Conference. Selected for inclusion in this annotated bibliography are those sources which are directly relevant to the migrant laborer's economic position, learning characteristics, and educational problems. Literature on remedial reading and the culturally disadvantaged could logically have been included, as these areas are related to the emphases of the Bucknell Conference on Learning Problems of the Migrant Child, but for the most part, it has been omitted. The first few pages of the annotated bibliography contain an evaluation section that rates the relevance of each document on seven criteria. This annotated bibliography was prepared by Patricia A. Rugh and Marlene L. Scardamalia. Those wishing a broader survey of related literature are referred to An Interdisciplinary Approach to Education for Migrant Children (1967), a selected bibliography available from the State Department of Education, Tallahassee, Florida.

EVALUATION SHEET

The material in the annotated bibliography has been evaluated according to the following criteria:

1. General description of the situation, needs, and problems of migrant workers.
2. Federal and state legislation for educational or labor conditions of the migrant workers.
3. Specific content and structure of effective educational programs for migrant children.
4. Description of existing schools or programs for migrant children.
5. Content and/or rationale for particular curricula for migrant programs.
6. Description of instructional techniques or approaches possibly applicable to migrant education programs.
7. Diagnosis of specific learning difficulties pertaining to educationally deprived children.

The columns are numbered in accordance with the above listing. A "+" in one of the seven columns indicates the nature of the content of the article.

Each article or book has also been rated on the basis of its relevance to the two Bucknell Conferences on Learning Problems of the Migrant Child and Facilitating the Learning of the Migrant Child. Three symbols are used for this rating:

*** Excellent (specific and applicable material)
** Good (pertinent, but no definite guidelines)
* Fair (very general information)

EVALUATION SHEET

AUTHOR (S)	CRITERIA						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Baime, C. F. **	+			+	+		
Bereiter, C. & Engelmann, S.***						+	+
Blackwood, P. C. **			+	+			
Blubaugh, R. **	+		+	+		+	
Bradman, M. & Kelley, K. C. ***	+		+	+			
Cheyney, A. B. ***						+	+
Coles, R. **	+						
Commonwealth of Penna. (1958) **	+			+			
Commonwealth of Penna. (1959) **	+			+			
Commonwealth of Penna. (1960) **	+			+			
Commonwealth of Penna. (1963) **	+			+			
Commonwealth of Penna. (1964) **	+			+			
Commonwealth of Penna. (1965) **	+			+			
Commonwealth of Penna., Dept. of Labor and Industry (1967) *	+						
Commonwealth of Penna., Governor's Committee on Migratory Labor (1967) *	+	+		+			
Commonwealth of Penna., Dept. of Public Instruction (1968) **	+	+					
Connecticut State Dept. of Education *	+			+			
Cutts, W. G. *						+	
Dowdy, G. T. **	+		+				

EVALUATION SHEET (Cont'd)

AUTHOR (S)	CRITERIA						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Educating Migrant Children *		+		+			
Edwards, E. P. ***	+		+	+			
First, J. M. *	+			+			
Florida Dept. of Education **			+	+	+		
Frierson, E. C. & Barbe, W. B.							
Brueckner, L. J. & Bond, G. **							+
Fletcher, L. G. **							+
Frierson, E. C. **						+	
Hirsch, K. **							+
Kirk, S. A. & McCarthy, J. J. ***							+
Frost, J. **	+		+	+			
Garcia, A. A. *	+						
Gomes, T. **	+						
Goodwin, W. L. ***	+		+		+	+	+
Haney, G. E. ***	+	+	+				
Harnishfeger, L. *	+			+			
Hefferman, H. *	+	+		+			
Karraker, C. ***	+	+	+	+			
Kell, L. & Alsup, B. *	+			+			
Kidd, M. C. *	+			+			
Laing, J. H. *	+			+	+		
Lake Byrd Conference Center **	+		+				

EVALUATION SHEET (Cont'd)

AUTHOR (S)	CRITERIA						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mackintosh, H. et al							
(1) **						+	
(2) **						+	
(3) **						+	
(4) **						+	
Moore, T. E. **	+						
Morales, H. **	+	+	+	+			
N.C.T.E. ***						+	+
N. J. Department of Education (1966-67) **	+		+	+			
Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare *						+	
Office of Continuing Education, Florida Atlantic University ***	+		+	+		+	
Ogle, A. *	+						
O'Hara, J. **					+		
Otto, W. & McMenemy, R. A. ***						+	+
Palley, H. A. *	+						
Potts, A. M. **	+		+	+			
Richards, C. V. **			+			+	
Sartain, G. *	+						
Sheridan, M. L. *	+		+				
Stern, P. M. *	+						
Sutton, E. (1960) **	+		+	+			
Sutton, E. (1961) *	+						
Sutton, E. (1962) *	+						

EVALUATION SHEET (Cont'd)

AUTHOR (S)	CRITERIA						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Taliaferro, E. *	+						
Texas Education Agency *	+			+			
Texas Education Agency, Evaluation Section, Div. of Comp. Education ***	+		+	+		+	
Texas Education Agency, Div. of Comp. Education **	+		+	+			
Thomas, D. R. & Stueber, R. **	+						
Thomasson, L. B., and Thomasson, M. E. **	+		+	+		+	
U. S. Dept. of Health, Education, and Welfare (directory of projects) *		+					
U. S. Dept. of Health, Education, and Welfare (health program, operations and needs) *	+	+					
Vera, J. *	+						
Winters, M. T. *	+						
Wood, N. *	+			+			

Baime, C. F. Migrant education has new meaning. *Wisconsin Journal of Education*, 1968, 100(8), 7-8.

Wisconsin 1967 summer school programs funded under a Title I Migrant Grant are described. Instructional objectives, based upon identified general educational needs of migrant children, included: increases understanding and appreciation of different cultural backgrounds; development of perceptual skills, facility in oral communication, skill in writing complete sentences; mathematical understandings; and creative expression.

The administrative structure of the nine programs is explained. Specific class descriptions suggest a wide variety in the approaches taken by the local districts.

Bereiter, C., & Engelmann, S. *Teaching disadvantaged children in the preschool*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1966.

Recognizing the fact that disadvantaged children of preschool age are already seriously retarded on tests of intellectual ability and that this retardation is most pronounced in language development and reasoning ability, the authors propose an intensive, accelerated approach in preschool instruction for these children. They reject the "whole child" approach because they feel that it, at best, can only lessen the child's many learning deficiencies, not eliminate any of them. In contrast, if the child's language deficiency could be dealt with, it is likely that his other, closely related handicaps could be remedied. Supporting this position is research showing that within a year the language handicaps of even severely deprived children can be overcome with simultaneous personality and social development occurring as well. The authors cover academic objectives and management of the preschool in addition to the basic teaching strategies that are vital to their program. Discussion of the language, arithmetic, and reading programs are both comprehensive and specific, with numerous examples of lessons and appropriate instructional techniques.

Blackwood, P. C. *Report of two conferences on planning education for agricultural migrants*. U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, July, 1957.

The concern felt in the Office of Education for the education of migrant children precipitated two conferences in May, 1957, one in Michigan and one in Mexico. This report presents the highlights of the discussions held, covering cooperation of the school organization and financial support, curriculum planning, and leadership development in migrant education. Specific projects are described at some length, and numerous recommendations, evolving from conference activities and interaction, are stated.

Blubaugh, R. School bills for migrants. American Education, 1968, 4(3), 5-7.

Efforts to educate migrant children in California are statewide, coordinated under a recently developed master plan. Because the migrant population is so great (78,000 children either lived in or passed through California in 1967), extensive federally funded programs are being conducted in only those counties with the greatest numbers of migrant children (27 counties out of 43).

District school programs vary widely in size and scope, but all emphasize reading development, because 85% of California's migrant laborers are Mexican-American. Among techniques being used in classes for migrant children are individualized instruction from bilingual teachers' aides and language specialists, specially prepared textbooks, field trips, and intensified instruction in English. Summer classes and evening tutoring as well as evening adult education classes in the camps are offered.

A major effort is being made to prepare present and potential teachers to teach migrant children more effectively. In addition, the California Master Plan for Migrant Children calls for increased interdistrict cooperation. A central records center is being established in Sacramento, where teachers can get information on migrant students' educational backgrounds. A record transfer system with four neighboring states is also being arranged.

Bradman, M., & Kelley, K. C. Summertime and the learning wasn't easy. New York State Education, 1963, 50(7), 20-22.

This is a concise, well-written account of a six-week summer school (1962) for migrant children near the King Ferry Labor Camps in New York. The authors describe the problems of language and deprived background which the teachers faced and discuss important characteristics of these migrant children (most of whom came from Florida) in some detail. Gains made by the children during the session are summarized.

Cheyney, A. B. Teaching culturally disadvantaged in the elementary school. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Books, 1967.

In writing this book the author attempts to span the gap between learning theory and present instructional practices used with the culturally disadvantaged. In the first section of the book he gives a realistic overview of the situation, discusses important characteristics of culturally disadvantaged children and those who teach them, and presents a number of definite strengths these children possess that he feels could serve as the basis of an effective curriculum. The second section of the book concerns language.

Language development of culturally disadvantaged children is discussed, and approaches to reading, listening, speaking, and writing are presented. Throughout the book, research studies are cited which provide a basis for the author's position. Numerous instructional techniques and materials that teachers have found effective in teaching culturally disadvantaged children illustrate the opportunities for practical application.

Coles, R. What migrant farm children learn. Saturday Review, 1965, 48, 73-74.

Written by a child psychiatrist who recently completed a two-year study of migrants, this article presents an excellent description of the migrant child's needs and way of life. The author points out that the migrant has little real need for an education, as it is largely irrelevant to his present existence. What little learning he receives in school the migrant forgets very quickly. As the author sees it, the problem is that of making this education more closely related to the needs and lives of these people, and thus more meaningful and desirable to them. He sees a specific need for regional networks of schools (some of them mobile), staffed by teachers genuinely concerned with the customs, values, and beliefs of the migrant.

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Department of Public Welfare, Bureau of Family and Child Welfare. Migrant child care centers and services in Pennsylvania. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, 1958.

This report gives an account of the services provided for migrants in Pennsylvania during 1958 by the Department of Public Welfare.

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Department of Public Welfare, Bureau of Family and Child Welfare. ... with the wind and the rain. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, 1959.

This annual report of the Pennsylvania migrant program describes community organization and planning, day care centers, and social services for children and families.

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Department of Public Welfare, Bureau of Family and Child Welfare. Reading for tomorrow. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, 1960.

The migrant programs offered in Pennsylvania during 1960 are described, with detailed accounts of various day care and child welfare services.

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, The Governor's Committee on Migratory Labor. *We rally to the harvest*. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, 1963.

This report gives a comprehensive account of the migrant program in Pennsylvania during 1963.

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, The Governor's Committee on Migratory Labor. *Pennsylvania migratory labor program*. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, 1964.

The 1964 migrant program in Pennsylvania, carried out through the cooperative efforts of the government agencies and volunteer groups, is described.

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, The Governor's Committee on Migratory Labor. *Pennsylvania migratory labor program*. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, 1965.

This annual report describes the migrant programs and services of government and volunteer agencies in Pennsylvania during 1965.

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Department of Labor and Industry. *Farm labor services -- Pennsylvania annual report*. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Bureau of Employment Security, 1967.

This concise report summarizes economic and employment trends in the state, discusses the impact of mechanization on the farm labor market, and describes procedures used in the recruitment of seasonal farm workers. Numbers and locations of migrant crews during the 1967 harvest season are given, as well as the community health, inspection, and welfare services offered migrant workers and their families. Crop sizes and consequent worker demand for the seven agricultural areas of the state are predicted for 1968.

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, The Governor's Committee on Migratory Labor. *Pennsylvania migratory labor program, annual report*. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, 1967.

The migratory labor program in Pennsylvania is coordinated by the Governor's Committee on Migratory Labor. The efforts made by the state departments of labor and industry, health, public instruction, public welfare, community affairs, and property and supplies are essential to the effectiveness of the program. These activities, as well as voluntary services of church groups, are summarized in this booklet.

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Department of Public Instruction. A state plan to regionalize and expand summer 1968 educational programs and services for children of migratory farm labor families in Pennsylvania. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Bureau of Curriculum Development and Evaluation, Division of Compensatory Programs and ESEA, Title I, 1968.

This informative publication briefly presents the historical background and characteristics of migrants in Pennsylvania and current activities and services as well as statistical data concerning the present status of migratory families in this state. Listings of educational needs and objectives for children of migrants provide an overall view of the entire scope of activities that must be engaged in to provide a meaningful education for these children. Other problems such as in-service training programs, pre-school programs, and summer educational programs are also discussed.

Connecticut State Department of Education. Educational program for children of migratory agricultural workers, under the provisions of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Hartford, Connecticut, 1967.

Connecticut's program, as assessed by the personnel involved in it, made primary gains in improving social, hygienic, and nutritional practices in migrants; secondary gains in improving children's interpersonal relationships; and little gain concerning changes in the basic skills and school attitudes of program participants. This state program provides a brief over-view of activities engaged in in Connecticut on behalf of the migrant child.

Cutts, W. G. Reading unreadiness in the underprivileged. NEA Journal, 1963, 52(4), 23-24.

The article stresses the need for cultural enrichment programs for the underprivileged, stating that although this approach may never be able to compensate fully for present deficiencies, it is the most productive manner for closing present gaps. Since adequate communication skills are the most important need of the culturally disadvantaged, the primary purpose of enrichment programs should be to provide experiences which will help children master the basic language skills of listening and speaking.

Dowdy, G. T. A curriculum guide for the seasonally employed agricultural workers program. Alabama: Tuskegee Institute, 1967.

This curriculum guide is organized to suit learning situations for the functionally illiterate migrant adult. Objectives in the areas of reading, spelling, writing, listening, observing, computative skills and social studies are defined and followed with suggested activities, special skills required and/or services to be rendered. Although the information contained in this booklet is not directly applicable to the migrant child, the curriculum guides and suggested readings provide excellent resource material in the more general area of migrant education.

Educating migrant children. School and Society, 1967, 95, 484.

This brief and concise article summarizes the scope of educational projects for migrant children being funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Some 97,000 children, from pre-school through high school, are benefitting from these programs in forty states. Short descriptions are given of Texas, California, and Oregon and Oklahoma projects.

Edwards, E. P. Children of migratory agricultural workers in the public elementary schools of the United States: Needs and proposals in the area of curriculum. Harvard Educational Review, 1960, 30(1), 12-52.

Although this article was written in 1960, its excellent review of migrant labor conditions is still pertinent. The brief account of the migrant laborer's background and the problems inherent in the migrant child's relations with the schools is a source of answers to questions often posed by teachers who lack experience in working with these children, and it offers some insight into problems that they may encounter. In the section "Attempts to Meet the Problems," the author discusses projects initiated by various states and agencies to combat the migrant labor problem. By combining the best points of each program, the author presents a comprehensive review of the literature available in 1960 concerning the educational objectives and methods that have been most efficient in dealing with migrants.

First, J. M. The educationally deprived. Michigan Education Journal, 1961, 39, 194-199.

The author discusses problems resulting from migrancy and several experiments which were attempted in an effort to combat these problems.

Florida Department of Education. Planning Florida's migrant education program. Tallahassee, Florida, 1966.

The 1966 workshop which this publication reports was concerned with development of a realistic and effective migrant program for the state of Florida. Consideration was given to a wide variety of educational problems. Consultants' speeches, included here, focus on such concerns as self concept development, selection of curriculum materials, inservice training for teachers, parent involvement, electrical processing of educational data, and evaluation criteria.

Frierson, E. C., & Barbe, W. B. (Ed.) Educating children with learning disabilities: Selected readings. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1967.

Five particularly relevant chapters in this book are abstracted immediately below.

Brueckner, L. J., & Bond, G. L. Diagnosis and treatment of spelling difficulties.

The diagnosis of spelling difficulties requires procedures ranging from systematic, standardized techniques to the application of informal observational procedures. The chapter gives a good summary of diagnostic procedures and appropriate treatments that can be utilized in the area of spelling.

Fletcher, L. G. Methods and materials for teaching word perception in corrective remedial classes.

Success in reading is based on the ability to identify words and to associate printed symbols with ideas. The author discusses three basic methods for teaching words: the sight method, the kinesthetic method, and the phonetic approach. The remedial teacher should be familiar with these and be able to combine them in accordance with individual situations.

Frierson, E. C. Clinical education procedures in the treatment of learning disabilities.

The clinical approach to learning stresses growth in terms of individual gain on measures of specific skills, and it necessitates the grouping of children according to ability; the traditional method develops an overall curriculum based on findings from several disciplines, and it groups children according to age. In using the clinical approach, the educator must be familiar with the different ways of teaching a subject. The author discusses twelve approaches for teaching reading. Although the chapter is not directly applicable to migrant labor problems, it does provide a method of coping with underachievement in general. This method depends upon thorough diagnosis, sound selection of teaching procedures, and objective measurement of success.

Hirsch, K. Tests designed to discover potential reading difficulties at the six-year-old level.

The tests discussed in this chapter are designed to measure the child's ability to pattern, structure, and respond to stimuli in general, and, to a degree, to integrate behavior. The testing helps to identify the children who are not ready for first grade. In addition, it assists in determining what type of help is suitable for each child. An excellent overview of the many reading difficulties that may be present is included, and suggestions for analyzing each difficulty are given.

Kirk, S. A., & McCarthy, J. J. The Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities — An approach to differential diagnosis.

The ITPA was developed to assess deficiencies in communication skills. It is meant to be used for diagnosis, to define how an educational or remedial program can be initiated rather than to classify the child into a particular category related to IQ level. The test is developed according to a theoretical model proposed by Osgood, and sub-tests have been developed which tap each skill involved in psycholinguistic abilities. Case studies are given which will help a user understand how the results can be applied to a remedial program.

Frost, J. School and the migrant child. Childhood Education, 1964, 41, 129-132.

A summer school (1962, 1963) for migrants in Arkansas is described. Covered in the discussion are school activities (with emphasis on their relatedness to the real experiences of the child), home life, basic human needs, and language capabilities of these children. The needs for such a school are defined as good teachers, time, space, and materials.

Garcia, A. A. Bridge to a better life. Texas Outlook, 1963, 47(3), 30-31.

This very general account of the migrant's situation places emphasis on the causes for the failure of migrant children in school. The author makes some suggestions for alleviating the situation.

Gomes, T. Migrant diary. Vista Volunteer, 1968, 4(2), 3-13.

A Vista volunteer gives a diary account of the month and a half he spent living and working with a crew of Mexican-American migrant farm workers in Florida. His impressions are vivid and include specific descriptions of conditions and conversations with the workers themselves. The workers' dependence upon the crew leader and the instability of their work are clearly evident in this account.

Goodwin, W. L. (Ed.) Bucknell conference on learning problems of the migrant child. Lewisburg, Pennsylvania: Bucknell University, Department of Education, 1967.

The primary focus of this conference was the analysis of the educational problems of the migrant child, in particular the Negro migrant child, and realistic means for helping these children overcome the cumulative deficits of their lack of educational experience. Academic objectives allowing these children to progress at a rate faster than the normal rate of learning were of primary concern. Consultants with expertise in the development of educational games, the Bereiter-Engelmann preschool for disadvantaged children, the development of instructional materials and computer assisted instruction conducted demonstrations and discussions in their respective areas. Small group involvement sessions were also held on the following topics: "Diagnosing Reading Problems of the Migrant Child," "History of Migrant Education; Learning Problems of the Migrant Child," and "Programs of Instruction for the Migrant Child based on the Concept of Individualization."

Haney, G. E. Problems and trends in migrant education. School Life, 1963, 45(9), 5-9.

The author, in 1963, worked in the Office of Education as a specialist in the education of migrant children and as a member of the ad hoc committee of the President's Committee on Migratory Labor and the Interdepartmental Committee of the U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. That he faces the migrant labor problem realistically is reflected in his writing. He presents a brief, concise, very informative, and well written summary of the problems facing migrants. These include seasonal impact on schools, school transfer records, grade placement of pupils, acquisition of teachers, school attendance problems, need for educational continuity, and financing school programs. Where possible, he gives suggestions for alleviating these problems and goes on to discuss the trends in migrant education on the local, state and federal levels.

Harnishfeger, L. A desk for Ignacio. Ohio Schools, 1965, 43(4), 30-33.

The educational program (1963) offered by the Pandora-Gilboa School District, Putnam County, Ohio, to Spanish-American migrant children is described. Because of the marked differences in reading and speaking abilities of the children, individualized instruction was emphasized. Materials and techniques were chosen for their relevance. Migrant children were separated from the resident students when the regular school opened in September because of their special needs.

Heffernan, H. Migrant children in California schools. California Journal of Elementary Education, 1962, 30, 228-236.

A survey of eighty districts serving migrant children in California was made in 1961. The findings reveal the inadequacies of the schools and illustrate a need for future legislation. The author uses five case histories to support his ideas and ends the article by suggesting specific goals, in the form of support for relevant legislation, which would lead to better education for the migrants.

Karraker, C. Education for our rural slums. School and Society, 1963, 91 (2229), 276-277.

This article is an excellent review of the problems confronting the education of migrant children. Because of their non-resident status, compulsory education laws of the states do not apply to migrant children. Consequently, school achievement is often found to be below the minimum standard of literacy. The author cites several states that have made progress in improving migrant education, focusing on the exemplary work of Colorado. This state has held summer schools for migrants since 1955, using experienced teachers and building facilities of the regular school system. The Migrant Educational Research Program in Colorado has led to a stronger, more extensive migrant program. Teachers of migrant children have attended inservice programs at Adams State College since 1957, and this college has become a center for studies in migrant education. The author stresses that much more needs to be done to improve educational opportunities for migrant children, including meeting the needs for day care centers for preschool children.

Kell, L., & Alsup, B. One cup of sugar: Home economics and migrant families. Journal of Home Economics, 1963, 55, 142-144.

A general description is given of methods used to provide a day care center for Mexican-Americans. Through the use of volunteers, graduate students, and undergraduate students, a program was set up which took into account the educational, medical and nutritional needs of the children involved. The article provides a general account of the migrant's living conditions.

Kidd, M. C. A chance to succeed. Texas Outlook, 1965, 49(8), 16-17.

In an experimental, concentrated program for migratory children in Texas (1963-64), a teacher condensed a regular nine month school term into six months and obtained comparable scores between migratory children taught at the quickened pace and residents who were taught the same material over a period of nine months.

Laing, J. H. Migrant school helps children catch up. *Nations Schools*, 1967, 79(2), 67-68.

This brief article summarizes the bilingual (Spanish and English) approach used in the Merced County Migrant School Project in California. Verbal skills are emphasized in the elementary classes by teachers and highly qualified aids. Child care centers provide meals and facilities for the hours during which parents are in the fields. Preschool education stresses language development, and evening classes in relevant skills are held for adults.

Lake Byrd Conference Center. *Report and recommendations of the consultation on services to children in the east coast migrant stream*. Avon Park, Florida, 1965.

This publication is the product of a 1965 conference held in Florida. Panel discussions and addresses are summarized, and participants' reactions and recommendations are noted. The need for intrastate and interstate coordination and continuity of services is emphasized, and some very good suggestions are made.

Mackintosh, H., Gore, L., & Lewis, G. M. *Disadvantaged children series*. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, 1965.

The four pamphlets in this series are abstracted immediately below.

No. 1. *Educating disadvantaged children under six*.

In this pamphlet, techniques are described that have been found useful in work with educationally disadvantaged children. Program emphases that are discussed include verbal ability, understanding of self and others as well as the environment, intellectual development, and emotional and cultural resources of the child. Other attributes of such an educational program (desirable teacher characteristics, parent-school relationships, supplementary services and facilities) are also discussed.

No. 2. *Educating disadvantaged children in the primary years*.

The discussion of special problems of the disadvantaged child in the primary school is based on the findings of research done in sixteen large cities in this country in 1964. Of special interest is the survey of "promising practices," covering organizational changes, reduction of teacher-pupil ratio, special staff assistance, relationship between the school and parents,

and summer school opportunities for these children. Special programs in New York, Baltimore, and Pittsburgh are covered briefly, and a large number of effective classroom activities are described in some detail.

No. 3. Educating disadvantaged children in the middle grades.

Following a format similar to that of the second pamphlet in this series, the authors discuss desirable goals and the scope of the curriculum for the middle grades. "Promising practices" which have been found effective by teachers of disadvantaged children are described, and summaries of special programs in Boston, Chicago, New York, Pittsburgh, and San Diego are included.

No. 4. Administration of elementary school programs for disadvantaged children.

This fourth pamphlet is written for administrators. It gives an account of some of the administrative problems and responsibilities involved, sketches the nature and extent of the elementary school problem, and summarizes the efforts made by school districts investigated in this survey, including the special provisions of sixteen of the cities studied.

Moore, T. E. The slaves we rent. Scranton, Pennsylvania: Haddon-Craftsman, 1965.

The book provides the historical background of the migrant labor situation. The deplorable conditions and frequent exploitation that are a part of the migrant laborer's daily life are vividly described.

Morales, H. From their hands, a feast. American Education, 1965, 1(10), 1-5.

This is a good summary of state and federal involvement in the improvement of migrant education (as of 1965). The author describes in detail a program in which he was involved, called Action for Community Development. He discusses the excellent and many-faceted progress made by one community, Meadow Wood Acres, near San Antonio, Texas, under this program.

National Council of Teachers of English, NCTE Task Force on Teaching English to the Disadvantaged (Cochairman: R. Corbin, & M. Crosby). Language programs for the disadvantaged. Champaign, Illinois: NCTE, 1965.

The NCTE in 1965 appointed a special task force to determine the effectiveness of language learning in special projects and

programs for the disadvantaged across the country. They sought to identify effective educational practices and, in particular, to study language learning among the disadvantaged. Reactions and comments given by consultants to the task force are particularly useful because the views presented reflect a wide variety of approaches. In addition, two reports review the critical aspects of research in linguistics and psychology as these areas pertain to disadvantaged learners. The book offers excellent guidelines for setting up future programs.

New Jersey Department of Education. A plan for the education of children and youth in families of migrant workers. Trenton, New Jersey: Division of Curriculum and Instruction, Office of Elementary Education, 1966-1967.

This state plan provides a general, comprehensive report of the problems affecting migrant peoples and the varied aspects of migrant education problems. Topics include: educational needs of migrant children and youth with suggestions for meeting these needs; administrative details; health programs; summer school projects for migrants; inservice education of staff; involvement and education of migrant parents; and intrastate, interstate cooperation.

Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. National conference on education of the disadvantaged. Washington, D. C., 1966.

The material dealt with at this conference relates to the broad category of the disadvantaged learner. Several subsections, however, give information applicable to the educational problems of the migrant child. These sections include: (1) Training and Reorientation of Teachers, (2) Getting Help for Teachers, and (3) What Approaches to Curriculum and Learning. Topics such as inservice teacher education, teacher attitudes, teacher aides, preschool education, remedial programs in basic skills, individual or small group instructional methods, teaching materials, etc. were discussed.

Office for Continuing Education, Florida Atlantic University. Planning educational programs for migratory children. Boca Raton, Florida, 1967.

The concerns of members of the conference reported in this report were twofold: (1) Administrative details for planning high-quality education for migrants were discussed. Topics included inservice training for teachers, state level responsibilities, interstate cooperation, transfer or records for migrants, etc.

(2) Actual classroom procedures were considered. Emphasis was put on the need for education related to the experiences, needs, and goals of migrants. Educational objectives include integrated classrooms, community experiences for migrants, vocational training and concentration on language deficits. A committee also selected, developed and modified instructional materials for the migrant child. A partial list of these materials is included in an appendix to this report.

Ogle, A. The plight of migrant America. America, 1966, 115(2), 33-34.

The author protests the apparent apathy of the majority of Americans toward the pathetic position of the migrant worker in this country. This distressing situation is briefly sketched, and statements by some concerned leaders in the United States are cited.

O'Hara, J. Disadvantaged newcomers to the city. NEA Journal, 1963, 52(4), 25-27.

Although this article is concerned with rural-to-urban migration, especially among migrants from the Southern Appalachians, it does make several points that are applicable to the constantly moving migrant child: (1) Since these children lack the competitive spirit that motivates many pupils in urban schools, teachers should capitalize on physical education, not as an end in itself, but as a means of developing interest in symbols and abstractions; (2) The school must begin instruction where the pupils are and not where it thinks they should be; (3) Greater attention must be given to reading skills; (4) Most academic subjects must be offered on at least three levels of difficulty.

Otto, W., & McMenemy, R. A. Corrective and remedial teaching: Principles and practices. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1966.

The authors' approach to corrective and remedial teaching is one that begins with diagnosis of the problem so that all learning begins where the child is, not where the teacher thinks he should be. The book is essentially a guideline to aid teachers in dealing with the problems associated with underachievement. Emphasis is placed on reading skills because it is the belief of the authors that success in all academic areas is dependent upon reading abilities; however, the methods described are generally applicable to all phases of remedial teaching. The book has a threefold purpose: (1) to present a resume' of techniques and materials that have been found useful in dealing with learning problems associated with underachievement; (2) to suggest a rationale for a specific approach to the development of programs of corrective and remedial teaching for children who are underachievers; (3) to suggest an orientation to remedial teaching. General fundamentals of diagnosis and remedial teaching as well as diagnostic and remedial techniques for specific skills are presented.

Palley, H. A. The migrant labor problem — its state and interstate aspects. Journal of Negro Education, 1963, 32, 35-42.

This article is concerned with the severe economic problems of the migrant farm laborer and with procedures which could help to alleviate the migrant's situation. The nature of the migrant labor problem is discussed and the positions of both the migrant and the farmer are presented. The author stresses the need for federal intervention.

Potts, A. M. School bells for children who follow the crops. Elementary School Journal, 1960, 60, 437-441.

This article describes the migrant children who participated in the five special summer schools Colorado opened in 1959 (lasting for periods of five to nearly eight weeks). Although the children fall into three cultural groups (Anglos, Spanish-American, and those without a readily identifiable cultural pattern), they share certain important characteristics. They possess serious language handicaps, reveal cultural differences which tend to separate them from resident students and from other subgroups, and initially accept and conform only to the values of their own group. The article closes with a description of Colorado's total program for the education of migrant children.

Richards, C. V. The migrant teacher. The Instructor, 1968, 77(10), 73-85.

Teachers with experience in previous migrant programs contributed ideas for this article. These practical suggestions are directed to teachers involved in summer school programs for migrant children, and the activities described are quite specific. Suggestions are made for recruiting students, improving the child's self-image, encouraging social skills, developing language and academic skills, expanding cultural experiences, and establishing health and safety habits.

Sartain, G. A new approach to the migrant problem. International Journal of Religious Education, 1964, 40(11), 18-19.

This article is primarily concerned with the problem faced by migrants who attempt to establish permanent residence; however, it does present a brief, general picture of the migrant laborer's position.

Sheridan, M. L. Family day care for children of migrant farmworkers. Children, 1967, 14(1), 13-18.

A pilot project through which children under three years of age were cared for in family homes by the day is described. This service has been offered for two summers in Columbia, Luzerne, and Potter Counties in Pennsylvania, and it has received strong community support. Because of previous successful experience with day care centers for their older children, parents of these youngest children were eager to cooperate and to enroll them. Quality of care offered was generally excellent and all involved (migrant mothers and children, day-care families) adjusted rapidly and well.

Stern, P. M. Children of neglect: A plea. Parent's Magazine, 1967, 42(1), 30.

The author presents the case of the neglected migrant laborer and points out the lack of legislation which makes the migrant's case an extremely difficult one to remedy.

Sutton, E. Knowing and teaching the migrant child. Washington, D. C.: National Educational Association, 1960.

The author has worked in the capacity of supervisory specialist in migrant education for a pilot project which was inaugurated July 1, 1954, continuing through June 30, 1957. This project was exploratory in nature. General information is included concerning the migrant laborers' living conditions and needs, and suggestions are given for coping with these factors. Instructional techniques, organizational arrangements, and curriculum ideas are presented which have been used in actual situations with the migrant child. The book provides a good summary of the migrant labor problem and of possible correction measures.

Sutton, E. When the migrant child comes to school. NEA Journal, 1961, 50(7), 32-34.

The author discusses factors which contribute to the insecurity and frustration of the migrant child. Included are such elements as irregular schooling, periodic uprooting and reading adjustments, and lack of cultural background. The opinion presented in the article is that these factors can be largely overcome by having the child feel accepted in his new group.

Sutton, E. Wider but not deeper. *Childhood Education*, 1962, 39, 71-74.

Although many occupations demand that the family be uprooted periodically, the families of migrant laborers are especially hindered in terms of educational experiences because of their disregard for education. Specifically, they lack competencies in communication and in arithmetic. The teacher's primary effort should be directed toward providing continuity of learning for these children.

Taliaferro, E. Tony finds a shell. *Texas Outlook*, 1963, 47(12), 24-25.

This is a brief story of a migrant child who learned to love school because his individual interests were taken into account.

Texas Education Agency, Texas Project for the Education of Migrant Children. *Application for migrant compensatory education project*. Austin, Texas, 1967.

This project proposal includes a summary of outstanding characteristics of the migrant child, the purposes and activities of the proposed work-study program as well as the functions of the staff, opportunities for parental involvement, and a four-page description of the summer educational program. The bulk of material concerns the budget for the project.

Texas Education Agency. *Summary evaluation report: Texas project for the education of migrant children*. Austin, Texas: Evaluation Section, Division of Compensatory Education, 1967.

This state-wide plan for migrant education involved 40 school districts in activities and services for approximately 17,000 children. The major emphasis was on curriculum development for summer programs. The curriculum stressed extensive study in English language arts, consumer mathematics, health and physical education, vocational-occupational orientation, and guidance and counseling activities. A demonstration school utilized to develop materials, to train teachers and aides, to provide an exemplary unit for effective training of migrants, to develop more effective ways of using special service personnel, etc. is described. Descriptive information concerning the migrant population of Texas and personnel involved in teaching migrants is also included. Evaluations of the Texas project suggest that it has been quite successful.

Texas Education Agency. *The Texas project for education of migrant children*. Austin, Texas: Division of Compensatory Education, 1967.

The Texas Project provides a six-month school program for children of migrant laborers whose home base is in Texas. This extensive program also offers medical and welfare services, and in 1967-68 served approximately 21,000 of an estimated 85,000 migrant children in the state.

This small bulletin was published as an aid to participating school districts. It summarizes the typical characteristics of migrant children in Texas, and presents the objectives of the project, a suggested program of instruction, and job descriptions for special service personnel.

Thomas, D. R., & Stueber, R. No desk for Carmen. *Teachers College Record*, 1959, 61, 143-150.

The major problems that the migrant laborer faces are (1) cultural isolation, (2) instability, (3) lack of concern on the part of those who are in a position to help, (4) lack of continuity in educational attempts, and (5) lack of interstate coordination. The authors believe that no one of these problems is insurmountable, and they give general suggestions which could be used to overcome these obstacles. The suggestions, though feasible, are limited in scope.

Thomasson, L. B., & Thomasson, M. E. *A demographic study of farm migrants in Delaware*. Dover, Delaware: Vocational-Technical Division, State Department of Public Instruction, 1967.

By providing both descriptive and factual data concerning Delaware's migrant population, and interpretations and implications based on this data, this report gives valuable general information regarding the plight of the migrant. More specific information regarding the educational problems and needs of the migrant child is also presented with primary emphasis on the nursery school child.

U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Public Health Service. *A directory of migrant health projects assisted by public health service grants*. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1967.

Migrant health projects receiving financial assistance from the Public Health Service under the Migrant Health Act of 1962 (as amended in 1965) are listed in this publication. These 115 projects, located in 36 states and Puerto Rico, provide sanitation services and personal health care.

U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Public Health Service. Migrant health program, current operations, and additional needs. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1967.

Statistics of the migrant health program (funded by the Migrant Health Act of 1962) as implemented throughout the nation are given in this pamphlet, with specific information concerning migrant laborers' living conditions, present health status, and health services being provided as of 1967. Migrant health program goals and the steps necessary to meet these goals are outlined.

Vera, J. Essentials first, for migrant students. Texas Outlook, 1967, 51(11), 28.

The author speaks from her own experience as a language arts teacher in migrant classes in Texas. She stresses that educational experiences for children of migrant laborers must be practical and meaningful. The teacher must be constantly aware of the children's background. A primary objective should be to teach the vocabulary of the migrant child's living and working environments.

Winters, M. T. Towns organize to help migrants. International Journal of Religious Education, 1963, 39(9), 14-15.

The author describes help given to migrant Indians in western Washington by church groups in neighboring communities. Medical and dental aid, day care for preschool children, worship services, and recreational programs for all ages offered to the migrants were generally very well received. No educational program was included.

Wood, N. Summer-school help for migrant workers' children. NEA Journal, 1962, 51(5), 18-19.

This is a very brief account of a six-week summer school for Spanish-American migrant children in Rocky Ford, Colorado.

APPENDIX D

LECTURE BY JEAN OSBORN

I thought I would try this morning to convey to you a complete picture of what we, at the Bereiter-Engelmann program at the University of Illinois, are doing.

The program has finished four years of work with young children from disadvantaged backgrounds. It has developed a curriculum and a method of teaching which have demonstrated that children of low learning potential can be transformed into children of high learning potential. The philosophy of the approach and the methods and means by which the transformation has been accomplished have aroused waves of controversy in various areas of the educational establishment, particularly in that area involving the education of young children. We begin our fifth year with a new and exciting venture which should have a calming and decisive effect upon the controversies that are raging among educators and psychologists concerning the education of young children, particularly the education of young disadvantaged children.

The United States Office of Education through its Project Follow Through is just beginning a major comparative study of compensatory education for disadvantaged children. I will begin my talk by giving a short description of this study, its goals, the reason for its existence, and its relationship to the work we have been doing at Illinois as well as to the entire Head Start program.

The Follow Through program is already one year old. It was established to provide funds to selected communities for the grade school education of children who had attended Head Start classes. Head Start was begun four years ago, and has been administered through the Office of Economic Opportunity. In setting up this program, the United States government was addressing itself dramatically and positively (and at last) to the educational, physical, and social problems of young disadvantaged children. Head Start was conceived as a program in which the children of the poor could be given sufficient help prior to going to public school, so that when entering formal public school, they would be able to achieve and succeed at the rate expected of them.

Although in some communities Head Start still runs for only six to eight weeks in the summer, it became apparent that its goal could not be accomplished in such a short period of time. Thus, year long programs have become more prevalent. A major study of children who attended summer Head Start classes in New York City indicated that although the children were more ready for first grade than those who had not attended a Head Start program, after six months in first grade the Head Start children's performance and achievement leveled off and the two groups were performing equally well in school.

The reasons for this leveling off can be interpreted in many ways. I will discuss two of them. One is that the quality of the curriculum in the Head Start classes was not substantial enough to have a lasting effect on the children. A second is that no matter what occurs in the Head Start classes, the children will continue to need special help in the public schools for long periods of time.

Even though Head Start classes can get children ready for kindergarten or first grade, the nature of their disadvantages is such that they need extensive and special help throughout the early grade school years at least if they are to maintain their gains and operate at grade level. I give these interpretations because I think that both are important: there must be a curriculum in Head Start that meets the needs of the children, and there also must be a careful and extensive program for them in the public school. I wish to point out that by a careful and extensive program I do not mean a watered-down program, but rather one which will train and educate the children to become fully competent members of American society.

To help find out what the public schools can do to make school a place for all children to learn, and to make available additional funds for schools required, Project Follow Through was created. In its first year, Follow Through communities were able, among other things, to place extra adults in the classroom, develop special curricula, extend the school days, and provide tutoring services. Children who had been in Head Start were thus able, in Follow Through classes, to continue to get the special educational and other services that they needed to succeed in school.

Last spring the Follow Through office embarked on a second phase of its program; it set out to determine what kinds of curricula and services are most effective in solving the educational problems of children in Follow Through classes. Twelve models representing widely varying approaches to compensatory education were selected; they range from a parent organized and run program, a curriculum based on a Piagetian organization of developmental tasks, the English Infant School, a Behavior Modification Model, and a curriculum based on games, to ours which I will describe later this morning. In April the 90 communities that had been chosen as Follow Through sites were invited to come to an unusual type of market place in Kansas City. Spokesmen from the possible models gave presentations to the representatives from schools. The school representatives then returned to their communities, discussed the models with parent groups and the school administration. A model was then selected by each community to be used locally for the three years. Stanford Research Institute is to do the evaluation of the entire program. Data collected over the three-year period will hopefully help educators to come to some conclusions about the effectiveness of the various approaches being tried out and about the whole notion of special compensatory programs for disadvantaged children.

The Bereiter-Engelmann program (currently being directed by Siegfried Engelmann and Wesley Becker) has 13 sites. Their variety of locations and populations will perhaps be of interest; they include: Spanish-American children in New Mexico; Mexican-American children in Texas; small-town white and Negro children in Tennessee and Mississippi; urban white and Negro children in Ohio, New York, Washington, D. C., Michigan, and Wisconsin; Indian children in South Dakota; and miners' children in a depressed area of northern Michigan. We have from 25 to

300 children in each of the sites, and a total of about 2,000 children. We will have the responsibility, in cooperation with the local school districts, for their education for the next three years. Our educational curriculum is not the only part of the Follow Through program; the program includes work with parents as well as special social and medical services. An important component of every Follow Through model is the training of parent aides, parent education programs, and the organization of parent and community advisory committees to participate in decisions affecting the program.

We are indeed pleased to be a part of such a study. We feel that the results of the investigation will indicate the strengths and weaknesses of all the models participating, and will clear away some of the smoke and mystery that hang over the area of compensatory education, particularly compensatory education for young children.

Let us turn to a description of what we will be doing at our sites, and a discussion of why we are doing what we do. In four years, we have observed that many of the children we have worked with are, at the age of four, at least one to two years behind children who are able to succeed in school. (This is now the moment for a brief, and inevitable discussion of terms; I am not going to use the terms middle and lower class. There are many middle class children who are not doing well in school and the reasons they are failing are probably very similar to the reasons lower class or disadvantaged children are failing. There are also disadvantaged children from poor homes who are doing very well in school. So these terms do not seem to suit the situation very well. Rather, I am going to talk about achieving children and non-achieving children.)

We believe that in order for children who are behind in intellectual and conceptual development to catch up with other children, they must be taught at a rate twice as fast as normal. Such a position implies a highly structured and teacher-directed program. Others who are concerned with the education of young children feel that children cannot learn this way and that they must be in a situation where they can experience and discover for themselves that which they must know. This is admittedly an over-simplification of the position of those who find our approach questionable, harmful, dictatorial, dangerous, etc.; I'm not making up those words, one can read all of them in various critiques, book reviews and observations about the Bereiter-Engelmann program.

In our work at Illinois we have tried to determine what potentially achieving children possess in the way of skills, concepts, attitudes and behaviors that enable them to do well in school, and then to teach these in the most efficient and effective way possible to children not possessing them. There are those who talk about the inadequacies of the public schools to meet the educational needs of any children. Our goal has been to get the children equipped so that they can go through the public schools as the schools are presently set up to teach them. The public school may be an imperfect institution, fraught with faults and in need of many reforms, but it is an institution in which a good proportion of the American population is able to gain the education and skills necessary to function in society. Of course, we are interested in better schools for all children, but we also want the children we are concerning ourselves with to benefit not only from the better future schools but also from the schools they will be attending tomorrow, next year, and two years from now.

The curriculum we have designed, with its emphasis on early reading, arithmetic and intensive language development, is taught by an intense and direct method which is very new to preschool and kindergarten education. In all three areas, a basic and simple presentational language is used. Teaching tasks are broken into subtasks. For each subtask the teacher presents some instruction, the children respond, and the teacher corrects or praises the response. The teacher works with small groups of children, leading them in a fast alternating statement, question and response pattern. There is much use of group response and of language patterns. The children perform the learning tasks with great enthusiasm under the direction of the teacher who is working from a highly ordered sequence of tasks.

The organization of the class itself varies widely from that of a traditional preschool or nursery. The school day lasts about two and a half hours. Language, arithmetic, and reading are taught in three 20-minute periods each. The children are divided, according to teacher evaluation of pupil performance, into three groups for work in three subject areas. The remaining hour is spent on various large and small teacher-directed group activities: music, writing, storytelling, workbook and vocabulary-building tasks and games. There is a

15-minute break for juice. Part of a large classroom has been divided into three small rooms which are used for the reading, language, and arithmetic classes. In each classroom there are small chairs and a chalkboard. The main classroom is equipped with tables, chairs, a piano, and a cabinet full of books, paper, pencils, crayons, and scissors. Aside from puzzles and a model barn and house, there are no toys.

This curriculum in arithmetic, reading, and language has been developed for four and five year old children; we will be extending it to a curriculum for the first three grades. We are adding music, art, science, and social studies programs.

We feel that such an extreme change in the early education of young non-achieving children is essential for their school success. In a comparative study run at the University of Illinois, the Bereiter-Engelmann children made a gain of 25 Stanford-Binet I.Q. points over a two-year period. At the end of their kindergarten year, this group was reading and doing arithmetic at the second-grade level. Children attending a traditional program gained eight Stanford-Binet I.Q. points at the end of one year, and after a second year in a public kindergarten, lost three of the original eight points. The Bereiter-Engelmann group has just completed first grade, and the data coming in indicate they are achieving at grade level or better.

I have now finished the main part of my talk, but would like to end with an examination of the question of the why of all the current special programs for large numbers of young children in the United States.

A feeling that is still all too frequently held by people, both in and out of the schools, is that poor non-achieving children could succeed in school if only they would work hard, or try, or if their parents would get them to school on time, with their clothes clean and their noses wiped. And that indeed, their parents could succeed in life if only they would do many of these same things. The concept of the poor boy who makes good is a vital part of our American tradition. Most white Americans are from families that one or several generations back were immigrants — people who were economically poor and strangers in this country, but who were able to achieve success despite the obstacles of poverty and lack of education, perhaps not even knowing the English language. Why can't the majority of today's poor and poorly educated help themselves and succeed on their own?

What are the differences between the poor of today, for whom we are now expending so much emotional and intellectual effort as well as vast amounts of money, and the immigrants of yesterday, most of whom managed on their own, without Federal funds, Title I programs, and Head Start, to achieve prosperity and success — and the middle class? It must first of all be granted that present 20th century society has less and less room for unschooled and unskilled people, whereas the immigrants of the late 19th and 20th centuries came to a country rich with opportunities for enterprising people, even for those without financial backing or technical education.

A quality that is common to the immigrants of yesterday and the disadvantaged of today is poverty; poverty with its concomitant physical, social, and emotional problems has significant and debilitating influences upon children as well as on entire families. It is our contention, however, that the most significant difference between the home of yesterday's poor immigrant and the home of today's poor native-born white or Negro is not embedded in some novel nature of today's poverty as compared to the poverty of yesterday, but rather in the vastly different home-teaching practices. A large number of European and Oriental immigrants brought with them a strong family teaching tradition, one that coïncided very nicely with that of the American schools their children were to attend. The children of the majority of today's poor families are not brought up in a tradition that matches the teaching mode of the schools they will attend.

Our public schools are set up to receive children in kindergarten and first grade who have a sophisticated command of language, and who have developed behavioral patterns that accommodate themselves to the teaching situations available in the classroom. The language that these children bring to school reflects a home environment in which the members of the family spend many hours each day talking to their children and to each other: explaining, teasing, joking, commenting, arguing, correcting, story telling, and song singing. These are all educational activities which prepare the child for school. This kind of verbal atmosphere is a wonderful place for a child to learn a lot of information about the world as it exists, both in and out of his home. Parents in such homes address themselves, either consciously and systematically or unconsciously and unsystematically, to teaching their children language which is used in school. If you would ask one of these Mothers, "How did you learn to be a teacher," she would probably say, "Well, I'm not a teacher — I'm just a Mother." When these children come to school, they know and are able to use the language that is to be used in their education. They are able to label and describe much of what they see, to predict future events, and to solve problems. They are ready to learn skills and acquire knowledge in the way in which the school is set up to teach them.

The family teaching tradition of the non-achieving child is quite different. Bereiter and Engelmann, in their book, cite some reasons for the lack of parent-child verbal interaction in many families. Most of these reasons are quite obvious: the large size of families; frequent lack of a father in the home; a working mother; and the high noise level of the home. These conditions push children out of doors, and away from adult contacts. I would like to add some other characteristics I have observed in my own visits to the homes of the children in our school:

(1) When children are around their parents, they are expected to be quiet and obedient. The good child is the quiet child. The parent-imposed disciplinary lid is either really on, or when the children are playing among themselves, really off.

(2) Questions are discouraged. When a child asks a question, a frequent response is, "Stop bothering me with your questions."

(3) The talk which the child hears has to do with the concerns and events of the home, and even then, there is no attempt to consciously explain to him every object within the home and every action that takes place there.

(4) Mothers or adults in the family spend almost no time explaining the world outside the home to the child. Books, the conventional middle-class means of bringing the outer world into the home, are absent.

(5) Television, an ever-present, ever-turned-on member of most lower-class households, does not seem to be an adequate means of teaching language and information to young children. This perhaps has to do with the middle-class language that is spoken on television, but perhaps more importantly, with the confusion that results from unexplained, uninterpreted images and speech on the television screen. We are talking about what is probably the most television-watching population in the world, and it is evident that this same population is one which has many language related learning problems.

(6) Praise and punishment are given in the briefest of terms and actions, and without explanation. Compare "That's a good girl," to "That's a good girl; your mommie likes it when you eat all your meat and carrots and don't spill anything. And you drank all of your milk, too! Daddy, don't you think she is a good girl?" Or, compare a slap or a "whuppin'" followed by "Quit that cryin', girl, an' shut your mouth" to "If you don't stop screaming and jumping on the couch you will have to be spanked. If you jump on the couch it will

> break. The couch is not as strong as you think it is. If you don't stop, then you'll get a spanking." The spanking may or may not follow, but if that child is spanked, it is evident she has simultaneously encountered lots of vocabulary, a variety of grammatical constructions, and has had a vivid experience with two if-then statements.

In making these observations of the learning-related child-rearing practices of the non-teaching home and the language of young children from these homes, we don't wish to portray such a home as an unsatisfactory place in which to raise children. Such a home is usually a very loving and lively place, but it is not sufficient as preparation for the public school. The child who is not prepared for the public school will typically spend a minimum of 10 frustrating and unfruitful years in such an environment.

I would like to conclude by saying that we feel a great sense of urgency about the children who come to our school, and about the many children like them in all sections of the United States. These are children who have serious educational problems and who do not have much time for their problems to be understood. We urge school administrators and teachers who concern themselves with the development of programs and classes for disadvantaged young children to consider carefully the real and pressing educational needs of the children. Good programs are expensive, particularly because many more than the usual number of adults in the classroom seem to be required. But, those concerned with the long-range costs of the education of children are urged to examine the enormous expense a school system incurs because of low-achieving children. Remedial reading and arithmetic teachers, special classes for retarded and disturbed children, school psychologists and social workers cost considerable money. These monies are commonly spent on low-achieving children beginning in the primary grades and continuing until they finish or drop out of school, and with only a modicum of educational effectiveness. Spending more money in the form of extra teachers and aides, in curricular materials, in teacher training, and in evaluation of programs in the early years, promises to be a more effective and economical way of dealing with the education of young disadvantaged children.

APPENDIX E

FISHBOWL OF SIX PARTICIPANTS ON SCHOOL VISITS

Each number refers to a participant. For one-half day, 1 and 2 visited a summer school for migrant children, while 3 and 4, and 5 and 6, made similar visits at two other schools. The interaction below represents their discussion (slightly edited for clarity) of these visits.

2 We visited _________, which is in the _________ School District. I've seen this school before and was impressed when I found out it was so nice inside. There were only four (4) migrant children involved in the classroom. My colleague and I were questioning the value of such a program because it only involved four students, yet required a full-time teacher, nurse, cook, and also a bus driver. So there were four people involved in educating four children. The pupils' grades ranged from kindergarten through sixth, and they were four sisters. Their father was in Florida and worked for Sears & Robuck; the mother came up by herself with the four girls to be the cook for the camp.

These children came from the _________ Camp. The other camp in the area, the _________ Camp, was described as very bad. There was supposedly garbage piled up in front about five feet high, no screen doors or screens in the windows, and a young, half blind girl taking care of the other children while the parents worked in the fields.

1 I'll interact if there are any questions later on.

6 The school we visited was at _________. It is a very little school, but neat and clean inside. The enrollment was 22, but not

everyone came everyday because they often had to work. It was interesting that some of the children who were not there yesterday, came today, so the program must be pretty interesting if they want to keep coming back. They have two teachers who work as a team, a full-time nurse and cook. The children came up with their snack of brownies and milk — it's amazing how these children can all come upstairs and sit down at a table very politely. The table conversation was not loud and they weren't throwing things around. It seems that if the only thing they teach these kids is manners, it's a help; and there was a great change, for the better, in their behavior since school started.

5 In the classroom, they were doing an exercise reviewing the "j" and "k" sounds. By way of demonstration, for example, the teacher would hold up a glass of juice and say what is this? Then what letter does it start with? She then said, if this was Kool-Aid, what flavor would it be? One little boy's answer was "presweetened."

The teacher said the children were really dressed quite well. The program administrator told us there was money in the budget for each child for clothing, but these children are clean, neat, and very enthusiastic. The first week they had this program, all children were taken to Geisinger on Tuesday and Thursday nights to be checked for TB, etc.; this was included on the State Health Bureau's budget. They did find one active case of TB, which protected the rest of the children.

6 They fill out record cards and don't give them to pupils, but teachers who have these children send the records to Florida after the children leave. Otherwise the records would be lost in their moving, which is characteristic of past situations. These teachers are beginning a record for the migrants. So far most of them have no type of record. This procedure has been set up by the State.

4 We visited _________, right outside of _________, and they're following much of the same procedure. They have about six (6) copies of these forms to fill out. Some of these are sent with the children, and then a copy is sent to Florida. For some information, a questionnaire was sent home for the parents to fill out, but not too much was gained. In some cases they got birthdays, but that was about it. It was interesting; I looked at one that had been returned — the child's last name, the father's last name, and the mother's last name were all different. This makes me wonder about the value of the records. . .

3 That may be accurate.

6 One child we noticed had a bandage on her arm but didn't know why.

4 They had two teachers, a full-time nurse, and a cook. It was interesting; the teachers said yesterday they had meat loaf, mashed potatoes, and gravy — which sounded like a good meal — but only one child ate, none of the rest would.

3 Ours was a different situation. There were eight children, seven between four and five years old, so the four- and five-year olders had extreme difficulty in communication but the eight-year-old was fine. The attendance is erratic. There were 8 there, but 10 or so are enrolled.

They're all going tomorrow for physicals and vaccinations.

1 We found the same thing, medically; children are all examined by a doctor. They all went to dentists and had flouride treatments. This was at a shopping center, and the kids were all mad because the teacher wouldn't give each a dime to ride the ponies. Coming back the kids were saying to each other, "I'll throw ashes in your eyes." And the others, "I'll get someone to beat you up when I get home." They're very unappreciative of anything that's going on. We're pretty much concerned about their attitude, but migrants aren't the only group who are not appreciative of what is done for them.

2 The girls here, four sisters, were also unappreciative. The more they got the more they wanted.

3 They were extremely demanding of things.

1 The girls, however, were not typical migrants. Their father had a pretty good year-round job with Sears.

The children from the __________ Camp, who quit coming back, were kept from coming back because the "team captain" was upset when __________ made some remarks about his camp. These children were slow, but very appreciative of what was done for them; however, they're no longer permitted to attend.

2 It seemed as though the crew leader was exploiting the migrants.

5 We saw a picture of the camp where these children live. It seemed a little like the ________ Camp, in ________. About 75 live there; it has 12 bedrooms, a large dining area, looked nice and clean and had many windows.

6 I think these teachers should be congratulated. The kids are enthused; they use a lot of visual aids.

1 Well, the instruction was good; I didn't mean to mislead anyone in this respect. The teacher used a lot of reading, professional games; she was a reading teacher, has a mobile lab, and is very well equipped to take care of the problems of education, but with four youngsters, she doesn't have much of a chance. The question in my mind, the education is fine, but can we justify this kind of expenditure for four youngsters when it's doubtful whether they need it.

4 I got the feeling that the two teachers were just babysitting and seemingly very little learning going on. When we got there in the morning they were singing songs, and then they read stories and from there they went out to play, then came in and sang again.

1 ________ had given hers Standard Achievement Tests and knew their reading levels, so I think she was approaching the problem very well.

3 I had sympathy for the teacher; the children won't produce with anything. It was almost an impossible case to work with these children. This seemed to be the whole problem, it took so much time to get them to do a simple thing because there was so little communication, especially with the younger ones.

5 They had a lot of individual instruction. They showed us the menu.

1 Did they serve breakfast?

5 No, they had a snack soon after they got there.

1 The children at our school got breakfast as soon as they got there — eggs and bacon, and also a snack later.

3 Ours had cereal.

Dr. Goodwin We're back on menu again. What were they learning?

6 Measurement. The teacher was pouring two cups of milk into a pint, but the children didn't get the relationship that there were two cups in a pint.

Participant Did any of these teachers ever have migrants before?

1 I think one of them did — she's retired.

Dr. Goodwin I believe for the two teachers at _________, it's their first summer with migrant children. I'm not sure though.

Participant Did any of the teachers say they had had any experience such as a conference like this one?

3 No, but we thought a conference such as this would have helped them a great deal.

5 The teachers we observed seemed to be very confident.

6 One of the teachers said that she had observed Mrs. Osborn.

Dr. Goodwin A very specific question was asked, but I don't think it has been answered: their learning activities, how were they progressing?

4 There was nothing as far as I could see. All they had was games. This was their schedule: singing in the morning, and they were handed a sponge with paint, but none of them knew what to do, so they just made lines.

The older one she tried to do some work with. She had given her a first grade work book and she had started to write letters. But the teacher had let her take it home, and she thought someone may have helped her with it.

6 They were trying to work with all subject areas; we saw some work in phonics. They had worked for a week before school started getting their program set up. There were a lot of materials around. __________ also said that the children were reading at a low first grade level when they came and they are all up to middle or high first now. These are children who are going into second or third grade, so they must have used some type of test, but we didn't ask them what.

4 __________ said there is one thing that they've really learned. When they first came they couldn't sit in a group and listen to stories, but now they can.

2 A lot of word cards, SRA individual programmed, etc. were used.

1 The nurse was using a set of Old Maid cards with one girl, and having her find likes. Really we were not there long enough to tell too much, but I think the teachers were making an attempt and doing a good job in bringing these youngsters along in reading, particularly.

They were using SRA reading labs, and __________ is a good teacher, so I'm sure they're progressing nicely. However, I'm not sure in my own mind that these children were really disadvantaged to a great degree.

In talking with the youngsters, I could understand their language more readily than I could that which our migrants here use. It just happened I knew the __________ area, so I talked to them about stores and where their father worked, so they opened up to me, but these kids were not any more retarded than half of the ones in the regular classroom.

Participant Are there more migrants that should have been in school?

1 Apparently there are only six, but I'm sure there are more 13 and 14 year olds who are working. Let's face it, they're not coming in the summer.

Well, yours was a better educational situation — 20 students. A staff for four children doesn't need to be . . .

6 Yes. But they started with only seven!

Dr. Goodwin Isn't it interesting, now we're talking about wanting more pupils in the classroom.

1 I think there's a difference in wanting more when you're talking about a ratio of 2:1.

Dr. Goodwin The suggestion seems to be that educators can't operate until we get up to a certain number of kids in the class!

It seems that in learning situations there's a heavy, but shared responsibility, not only on the part of the teacher, but on the part of the learner. And you can take it one step further. There's probably a heavy responsibility on the part of the administrator and the teacher; if the two are both interested in what the other is doing, things go pretty well. If the teacher and learner are both putting maximally into the situation, it goes much better than if one is knocking himself out and the other is coasting. We've got some pretty dramatic evidence of this on video tape. Remind me tomorrow to mention Dr. Ivy's video recording tape.

I don't want to keep you too late. I have tomorrow's schedule! Have we ever passed out tomorrow's schedule as early as the night before?

Participants (In unison) NO!

Dr. Goodwin Well, I hate to ruin our record, but here it is!

MIGRANT CONFERENCE: EDUCATIONAL GAMES

1. Date ______________________ 2. Name ______________________

3. Home Address ______________________ 4. School District ______________________

5. School ______________________ 6. School Phone ______________________

7. What is your position in your school district? ______________________

8. If teacher, what grade do you teach? ______________________

9. If teacher, what subjects do you teach? ______________________

10. How do you personally feel about educational games?
Very Unfavorable Unfavorable Neutral Favorable Very Favorable

11. How much use do you feel educational games are in work with migrant children?
Much Use Some Use Neutral Little Use No Use

12. How well do you understand the meaning of the term "educational games"?
Very Poorly Poorly Neutral Well Very Well

13. Do educational games have an important role to play in education?
Definitely Yes Probably Yes Neutral Probably Not Definitely Not

14. Did you gain ideas you can use with migrant children?
(Circle one) Yes Partially No

15. Do you plan to use games in your classes this coming school year?
(Circle one) Yes No

16. If you answered number 15 yes, would you like a staff member to visit your class during the game and to relate suggestions to you after it is played?
(Circle one) Yes No

17. Have you previously attended a games workshop this summer?
(Circle one) Yes No

APPENDIX F
Instrument 2a

BUCKNELL CONFERENCE ON FACILITATING THE LEARNING OF THE MIGRANT CHILD

NAME ______________________ DATE ______________

There are no correct answers to the following items. Please read them carefully and respond candidly. An honest response is needed to make the instrument valid, not a response that you think is desirable (relative to the purposes of the Conference as published).

Your responses to particular items will not be divulged or made a part of any public record. The purpose of the survey is primarily to gauge the effectiveness of the staff's instructional format and procedures.

On each of the items:

1. Circle the response closest to your present feeling on the matter; and
2. Indicate why you feel as you do on each item.

1. How possible do you expect it might be to develop instructional techniques to facilitate and promote the learning of migrant children?

Extremely Unlikely	Unlikely	Neither Unlikely or Likely	Likely	Extremely Likely

Why do you feel this way?

2. How possible do you expect it might be to develop instructional materials to facilitate and promote the learning of migrant children?

Extremely Unlikely	Unlikely	Neither Unlikely or Likely	Likely	Extremely Likely

Why do you feel this way?

3. It is fairly well-documented that migrant children have considerable difficulty in performing well on school tasks. What do you believe causes this poor performance, the inherent, inherited traits in the child or environmental factors acting on the child?

Almost solely caused by inherent traits in the child.

More caused by inherent traits than by environmental factors.

Equally caused by inherent traits and environmental factors.

More caused by environmental factors than by inherent traits.

Almost solely caused by environmental factors acting on the child.

Why do you feel this way?

4. How confident are you that you could successfully facilitate the learning of a migrant child (as compared to facilitating the learning of "regular" classroom pupils)?

Much less confident about facilitating the learning of migrants.

Less confident about facilitating the learning of migrants.

Equally confident about facilitating the learning of both groups.

More confident about facilitating the learning of migrants.

Much more confident about facilitating the learning of migrants.

Why do you feel this way?

APPENDIX F
Instrument 2b

BUCKNELL CONFERENCE ON FACILITATING THE LEARNING OF THE MIGRANT CHILD

AFFECTIVE SURVEY

NAME ______________________________ DATE ______________________

There are no correct answers to the following items. Please read them carefully and respond candidly. An honest response is needed to make the instrument valid, not a response that you think is desirable (relative to the purpose of the Conference as published).

Your responses to particular items will not be divulged or made a part of any public record. The purpose of the survey is primarily to gauge the effectiveness of the staff's instructional format and procedures.

On each of the items:

1. Circle the response closest to your present feeling on the matter; and
2. Indicate why you feel as you do on each item.

1. How possible do you expect it might be to develop instructional techniques to facilitate and promote the learning of migrant children?

Extremely Unlikely	Unlikely	Neither Unlikely nor Likely	Likely	Extremely Likely

Why do you feel this way?

Have your feelings of two weeks ago changed because of this Conference? If so, how?

2. How possible do you expect it might be to develop instructional materials to facilitate and promote the learning of migrant children?

Extremely Unlikely	Unlikely	Neither Unlikely nor Likely	Likely	Extremely Likely

Why do you feel this way?

Have your feelings of two weeks ago changed because of this Conference? If so, how?

3. It is fairly well-documented that migrant children have considerable difficulty in performing well on school tasks. What do you believe causes this poor performance, the inherent, inherited traits in the child or environmental factors acting on the child?

Almost solely caused by inherent traits in the child.

More caused by inherent traits than by environmental factors.

Equally caused by inherent traits and environmental factors.

More caused by environmental factors than by inherent traits.

Almost solely caused by environmental factors acting on the child.

Why do you feel this way?

Have your feelings of two weeks ago changed because of this Conference? If so, how?

4. How confident are you that you could successfully facilitate the learning of a migrant child (as compared to facilitating the learning of "regular" classroom pupils)?

Much less confident about facilitating the learning of migrants.	Less confident about facilitating the learning of migrants.	Equally confident about facilitating the learning of both groups.
More confident about facilitating the learning of migrants.	Much more confident about facilitating the learning of migrants.	

Why do you feel this way?

Have your feelings of two weeks ago changed because of this Conference? If so, how?

BUCKNELL CONFERENCE ON FACILITATING THE LEARNING OF THE MIGRANT CHILD

COGNITIVE SURVEY

Mark the best answer for each of the following items on the accompanying answer sheet. One point for each item unless otherwise marked. If you are not sure of the answer, guess.

1. The preference that an individual may have for favoring one side of his body over the other is known as

   A. the Delacatto Effect.

   B. counter-side dexterity.

   C. the Durrell Effect.

   D. lateral dominance.

2. Via the formula suggested in Otto, a pupil with a mental age of 10 years and 0 months, a chronological age of 11 years and 6 months, an IQ of 87, and a reading age of 8 years and 5 months, would have a reading disability of

   A. 3 years and 1 month.

   B. 1 year and 7 months.

   C. 1 year and 6 months.

   D. 2 months.

3. Assume that the child's reading disability in the previous item was 4 months. Otto would consider this as __________ evidence of the child being a disabled reader, and further would point out that the method used to derive the disability is ______________________.

   A. good; the best available.

   B. good; only one of many possible methods.

   C. little; the best available.

   D. little; only one of many possible methods.

4. A reliable test for diagnostic purposes

   A. is valid.

   B. gives consistent results.

   C. is extremely difficult to find.

   D. gives trustworthy results.

COGNITIVE SURVEY

5. Otto classifies the correlates of learning disability into three general categories:

   A. biological; psychological; and environmental.

   B. biological; sociological; and attitudinal.

   C. psychological; sociological; and attitudinal.

   D. environmental; physical; and attitudinal.

6. The behavior you (the teacher) would like the learner to be able to demonstrate at the time your influence over him ends is known as

   A. stimulus-response behavior.

   B. learning behavior.

   C. terminal behavior.

   D. transfer-behavior.

7. Which one of the following verbs is least used in writing behavioral objectives?

   A. To write.

   B. To understand.

   C. To contrast.

   D. To list.

8. Behavioral objectives are observable, measurable, and concrete to

   A. the learner.

   B. the teacher.

   C. both the learner and the teacher.

   D. neither the learner nor the teacher.

9. Which one of the following is an incorrect statement about behavioral objectives?

   A. They relate or refer to misbehavior in the classroom.

   B. They state what the learner will be doing when he completes a learning experience.

   C. They describe a proposed change in the learner.

   D. They describe a pattern of performance.

10. A guideline for preparing instructional (behavioral) objectives was written by

    A. Clark Abt.

    B. James Conant.

    C. Robert Mager.

    D. Benjamin Bloom.

COGNITIVE SURVEY

11. Which one of the following is not measured by the Durrell Analysis of Reading Difficulty?

    A. Listening comprehension.

    B. Visual memory of word forms.

    C. Most of the severe reading problems.

    D. Spelling and handwriting.

12. Which one of the following levels of reading performance is not provided for in the check lists and test situations in the Durrell Analysis of Reading Difficulty?

    A. Non-reader or preprimer level.

    B. Primary grade reading level.

    C. Intermediate grade reading level.

    D. Secondary grade reading level.

13. How much time is required to administer the Durrell Analysis of Reading Difficulty?

    A. 30 to 90 minutes.

    B. Exactly 1 hour.

    C. Exactly 30 minutes.

    D. 2 to 3 hours in two test sessions.

14. For the purpose of accurate analysis, the Durrell Analysis of Reading Difficulty is intended to be given

    A. only in its entirety.

    B. in small group sessions.

    C. on an individual basis.

    D. Both A and B are correct.

15. Although the order of the subtests of the Durrell Analysis of Reading Difficulty is optional, which subtest does the manual recommend as the first to administer?

    A. Oral Reading.

    B. Word Recognition.

    C. Letter Recognition.

    D. Auditory Analysis of Word Elements.

COGNITIVE SURVEY

16. If a student solves the following problem, 22 + 9, and gives an answer of 33, the most probable explanation for the mistake is that

    A. the student made a careless error.

    B. the student does not know the sum of 9 + 2.

    C. the student made a guess but was wrong.

    D. None of the above answers are sufficient to account for the error without further information.

17. If a child is having difficulty with multiplications of whole numbers, this may be an indication that

    A. the child has not memorized the multiplication tables.

    B. the child does not have an adequate understanding of the operation of multiplication.

    C. the child does not have a meaningful working concept of numbers.

    D. All of the above are correct.

18. According to Otto, one of the main reasons for most arithmetic failures results from

    A. certain students having poor memories.

    B. ineffective teaching.

    C. environmental factors.

    D. poor textbooks.

19. A basic diagnostic technique to use in remedial arithmetic is to

    A. give the pupil more drill work.

    B. take the pupil through each step of the operation by having him work the problem aloud.

    C. give the pupil a standardized achievement test to determine specific deficiencies.

    D. assign the pupil to a student with similar difficulties so they can work out their problems together.

20. Causes for pupil failure in mathematics understanding are

    A. easy to diagnose because mathematics has a logical structure.

    B. often due to the failure of pupils to understand the symbolism used.

    C. often due to the lack of mathematics in the students' environment.

    D. difficult to determine as they usually are multiple and interactive.

COGNITIVE SURVEY

21. Which one of the following factors might have the most detrimental effect upon teacher success in using educational games?

    A. Allowing students to develop their own strategies.

    B. Maintaining substantial control over classroom activities.

    C. Considering the game a serious form of education.

    D. Avoiding correcting minor errors.

22. Which type of game causes the most interaction among players?

    A. Role play.

    B. Hybrid.

    C. Board.

    D. None of the above.

23. The term used to denote the discussion period following the playing of an educational game is called the

    A. critique.

    B. summary period.

    C. review.

    D. debriefing.

24. The basic difference between games and simulations is that

    A. a game results in the identification of a winner whereas a simulation need not have a winner.

    B. there are fewer winners in games than there are in simulations.

    C. Both A and B.

    D. Neither A nor B.

25. Which one of the following should you do first when writing an educational game?

    A. Develop a scoring system and a win criteria.

    B. Establish rules to govern interaction of the players.

    C. State educational objectives some of which should be behavioral.

    D. Decide the type of game that can best help the student reach the objectives.

COGNITIVE SURVEY

26. According to Bereiter & Engelmann, the kind of preschool needed for disadvantaged children is

    A. similar to those already in existence (e.g., nursery schools).
    B. similar to those already in existence but longer in duration.
    C. not similar to those already in existence and well-rounded in all subject areas.
    D. not similar to those already in existence and selective in the subject areas covered.

27. According to Bereiter & Engelmann, the culturally deprived child is most disadvantaged in

    A. vocabulary.
    B. grammar.
    C. cognitive uses of arithmetic.
    D. cognitive uses of language.

28. Bereiter & Engelmann would suggest that disadvantaged children's basic problems are primarily

    A. social and emotional.
    B. intellectual or cognitive.
    C. Both A and B are correct.
    D. Neither A nor B is correct.

29. Those strategies suggested by Bereiter & Engelmann for producing the necessary learning in preschool children within a given time period might best be termed

    A. direct instruction.
    B. verbal bombardment.
    C. Both A and B.
    D. Neither A nor B.

30. Bereiter & Engelmann's approach to preschool education for the disadvantaged child might best be described as

    A. socially oriented.
    B. academically oriented.
    C. creatively oriented.
    D. They place equal emphasis on all of the above.

BUCKNELL CONFERENCE ON FACILITATING THE LEARNING OF THE MIGRANT CHILD

COGNITIVE SURVEY

PART II

Mark the best answer for each of the following items on the accompanying answer sheet. One point for each item unless otherwise marked. If you are not sure of the answer, guess.

31. In which one of the following alternatives is the most logical sequence presented?

    A. Diagnosis; Learning Activity Development; Behavioral Objectives; Evaluation.

    B. Behavioral Objectives; Diagnosis; Evaluation; Learning Activity Development.

    C. Diagnosis; Behavioral Objectives; Learning Activity Development; Evaluation.

    D. Learning Activity Development; Behavioral Objectives; Diagnosis; Evaluation.

32. A sixth grade boy has a CA of 11 years, 0 months; an MA of 12 years, 6 months; and a Reading Age (RA) of 11 years, 9 months. His IQ is

    A. 114

    B. 106

    C. 94

    D. 88

33. In a random group, an IQ of 116 would place an individual above ________ persons out of every hundred on this characteristic.

    A. 50

    B. 68

    C. 84

    D. 98

34. The Durrell Analysis of Reading Difficulty would probably be considered by Otto to be operating at which level of diagnosis?

    A. Survey.

    B. Specific.

    C. Intensive.

    D. It would depend upon the learner involved.

35. One would expect what percent of the "normal population" to fall between an IQ band of 84 to 116 (+ and - one standard deviation)?

    A. 84%

    B. 68%

    C. 50%

    D. 34%

36. Which of the following statements of characteristics best describes this statement: "The student must know the five cardinal rules of homocide investigation."

    A. Terminal behavior and criterion of acceptable behavior are identified.

    B. Only the criterion of acceptable performance is identified.

    C. Only the terminal behavior is identified.

    D. Neither the terminal behavior nor the criterion of acceptable performance is identified.

37. Which of the following characteristics best describe this statement: "The student must be able to understand the theory of evolution; evidence of understanding will be obtained from a written essay on evolution."

    A. Terminal behavior and criterion of acceptable behavior are identified.

    B. Only the criterion of acceptable performance is identified.

    C. Only terminal behavior is identified.

    D. Neither the terminal behavior nor the criterion of acceptable performance is identified.

38. To describe terminal behavior, which one of the following activities is necessary?

    A. Define the important conditions under which the behavior will occur.

    B. Specify the learning activities to achieve the behavior.

    C. Define the criterion of acceptable performance.

    D. Identify and name the overall behavior act.

39. The classification of educational goals can be divided into three domains. Which one of the following is not one of the classifications?

    A. the cognitive domain.

    B. the affective domain.

    C. the psychological domain.

    D. All the above are the ordinary classifications.

40. In the viewpoint expressed in this Conference, behavioral objectives are seen as

    A. one of the better methods for specifying many objectives for learners.

    B. a method which is applicable to all possible objectives in education.

    C. the best way of facilitating pupil learning.

    D. None of the above are correct.

41. The check lists of difficulties on the subtests of the Durrell can be considered more important than the norms provided with the test because

    A. the norms are based upon the performance of an unusually disabled group of students.

    B. the norms are based upon the performance of a limited number of students.

    C. the check lists indicate the student's (reading) grade level.

    D. the check lists can suggest a remedial program for the child.

42. The lowest level of letter perception that is adequate for beginning reading is

    A. matching letters.

    B. recognizing blends.

    C. copying one-syllable words.

    D. naming letters from memory (after tachistoscopic presentation).

43. In which of the following tests would a grade three reader reveal through his spelling that he attends to only the beginnings of words that he sees?

    A. Oral Reading

    B. Hearing Sounds in Words

    C. Word Recognition and Word Analysis

    D. Visual Memory of Words

44. The Phonic Spelling of Words test can reveal

    A. lack of understanding of word meaning.

    B. inability to recall the correct visual form of a word.

    C. how well the child has learned to spell words on his grade level.

    D. None of the above are correct.

45. For migrant children, the Durrell Analysis of Reading Difficulty is most useful as a

    A. permanent record of the child's reading level.

    B. source of specific remedial activities to be used with the child.

    C. technique for identifying specific weaknesses and faulty reading habits in which the child could receive remedial instruction from the teacher.

    D. first step in planning a complete program of remedial instruction in the child's areas of reading difficulty.

46. Pre-school children's mathematical experiences should include

   A. measurements.
   B. basic counting.
   C. exposure to number symbols.
   D. All of the above are correct.

47. Inability to count by groupings is a symptom of

   A. poor vocabulary.
   B. advanced maturity.
   C. visual problems.
   D. None of the above are correct.

48. Most diagnosis in mathematics is based upon the concept that mathematical skills are

   A. independent of each other.
   B. horizontal in nature.
   C. hierarchical until about grade 8, then independent.
   D. None of the above are correct.

49. Otto points out that one of the educational factors which is a cause of some of the learning problems in arithmetic is

   A. overemphasis upon the inquiry training approach.
   B. not enough emphasis placed upon drill and memorization.
   C. overemphasis on drill and memorization without understanding.
   D. Both A and C are pointed out by Otto.

50. Otto points out that the majority of problems in arithmetic come from

   A. reading difficulties.
   B. problem solving difficulties.
   C. computational difficulties.
   D. None of the above are correct.

51. A standard or test by which terminal behavior is judged or evaluated is called a

   A. standard.
   B. criterion.
   C. performance.
   D. reference point.

52. The behavior you would like the learner to be able to demonstrate at the time your influence over him terminates is known as

    A. criterion behavior.

    B. exit behavior.

    C. learned behavior.

    D. None of the above are correct.

53. A scenario describes which of the following?

    A. The player's personality.

    B. The setting for the game.

    C. Both A and B.

    D. Neither A nor B.

54. Which one of the following statements is true?

    A. All games are simulations but not all simulations are games.

    B. Games are seldom simulations and simulations are seldom games.

    C. All simulations are games but not all games are simulations.

    D. None of the above are correct.

55. It is recommended when designing a game that you write

    A. both behavioral and general objectives.

    B. nearly all general objectives.

    C. nearly all behavioral objectives.

    D. None of the above are correct.

56. Janet is 6 years old, her family has always followed the migrant streams, and she has recently been diagnosed as having an IQ of 85. For her, according to Bereiter & Engelmann, academic achievement will be primarily dependent upon concentrated lessons in

    A. reasoning ability or logical development.

    B. social developmental learning.

    C. mastery of specific rote-learning tasks.

    D. Both A and B.

57. A boy who says "Uai - ga - na - ju" instead of saying "I ain't got no juice" must be taught to

    A. speak in words.

    B. make his utterances comprehensible as sentences.

    C. say "am not" instead of "ain't."

    D. read word by word.

58. The primary goal of the Bereiter-Engelmann preschool arithmetic program involves teaching the child to

    A. specify what 6 + 5 equals.

    B. specify what 9 - 2 equals.

    C. count by threes twelve times.

    D. multiply and divide with numerals below five.

59. Johnny is a disadvantaged child in your preschool. He is extremely reluctant to participate in activities with other children and you notice that he can not identify even the basic colors. As a teacher in a Bereiter-Engelmann school you would NOT

    A. prevent incorrect responses whenever possible.

    B. adhere to a rigid, repetitive presentation pattern.

    C. require students to reply in unison during lessons involving colors.

    D. work with the child individually in a study group for a maximum of 5 to 10 minutes each day until he can perform with other children in the class.

60. Which of the following do people of the Bereiter-Engelmann school consider to be the main cause of intellectual and academic deficiencies in disadvantaged children?

    A. Lack of verbal learning.

    B. Lack of concrete learning.

    C. Lack of exploratory learning.

    D. Both B and C are correct.

BUCKNELL CONFERENCE ON FACILITATING THE LEARNING OF THE MIGRANT CHILD

OVERALL SUMMATIVE EVALUATION

FRIDAY, AUGUST 30, 1968

Evaluation by ______________________________ (Name)

In answering these questions, please be candid and direct. The evaluation of the conference can be most useful if it can draw from your honest reactions and constructive criticism.

1. What did you, personally, hope to gain from your participation in this conference? (Please list below)	2. To what extent was each expectation fulfilled? (Please list below)
A.	A.
B.	B.
C.	C.

3. What use do you plan to make of the learnings that you have gained from the conference?

Key: On many items, these symbols will be used:

DY — Definitely Yes
PY — Probably Yes
NOP — No Opinion
PN — Probably No
DN — Definitely No

A. Physical Accommodations

1. Rate each of the following by checking the appropriate column.

	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor	(Didn't Use)
Dormitory Facilities	____	____	____	____	____
Cafeteria Facilities	____	____	____	____	____

2. Were you satisfied with the amount of information sent to you before the conference concerning room and board and the recreational facilities in the area? (Circle One)

DY PY NOP PN DN

Explain:

B. Materials

1. Do you think it was a good idea to distribute reading materials to participants before the conference began? (Circle One)

DY PY NOP PN DN

Explain:

2. If you had had your materials for a longer period of time before the conference, would you have done more reading? (Circle One)

DY PY NOP PN DN

Explain:

If you felt that you did not receive your materials within ample time before the conference began, when did you first realize this? (Check One)

Before the conference began ☐

After the first day of the conference ☐

Other ☐

Explain:

3. Did you make use of the annotated bibliography that was sent to you? (Circle One)

Yes No

If Yes, to what extent? (Explain what other reading you did, if any, both before and during the conference.)

4. How useful have you found the four books that were sent to you?

	Very	Moderately	Little	Not at All	(Didn't Read)
Bereiter (green)	____	____	____	____	____
Cheyney (yellow)	____	____	____	____	____
Otto (purple)	____	____	____	____	____
State Plan	____	____	____	____	____

5. Did you do any reading in these books during the past two weeks? (Circle One)

Yes No

If so, approximately how many hours during the two weeks did you spend on each book?

Bereiter ________ Hours

Cheyney ________ Hours

Otto ________ Hours

State Plan ________ Hours

6. Rank each of the four books from 1 to 4 (1 being the highest) in terms of the following criteria (all 12 blanks should be filled in):

	Bereiter	Cheyney	Otto	State Plan
(a) most interesting rank	___	___	___	___
(b) most thought provoking rank (ideas that were new to you)	___	___	___	___
(c) most relevant to the concerns of this conference rank (i.e., facilitating the learning of the migrant child)	___	___	___	___

7. Should all three books have been included in the reading materials? (Circle One)

DY PY NOP PN DN

Explain:

8. What book(s), if any, would you have added to the recommended reading material for the participants?

C. Structure and Content of the Conference

1. As a whole, what is your opinion of the choice of activities for the conference? (Circle One)

   Excellent   Good   Average   Poor   Very Poor

2. In what order from 1 to 4 (1 being the highest) would you rank the four Guest Speakers in terms of the following criteria (all 8 blanks should be filled in)?

	Rev. Charles C. Frazer, Migrant Ministry	Mr. Richard Shatzer, Farm Labor Service	Mr. John M. Hyams, DPI	Sgt. James, Penna. State Police
(a) most interesting rank	____	____	____	____
(b) contribution to the conference objectives rank	____	____	____	____

3. Did you feel the Guest Speakers had ample time to present their main ideas? (Circle One)

   DY   PY   NOP   PN   DN

   Explain:

4. Were you in the group that made the conference call to Sgt. James?

   Yes   No

   If yes, was the conference telephone satisfactory to meet your need for additional information from him?

   DY   PY   NOP   PN   DN

   Explain:

5. Did you feel the camp visits were beneficial? (Circle One)

DY PY NOP PN DN

Explain:

6. Was the film "Harvest of Shame" of interest to you? (Circle One)

DY PY NOP PN DN

Was it presented at an appropriate time? (Circle One)

DY PY NOP PN DN

What was your opinion of the film?

7. Was the film "The Migrant Education Story" of interest to you? (Circle One)

DY PY NOP PN DN

Was it presented at an appropriate time? (Circle One)

DY PY NOP PN DN

What was your opinion of the film?

8. Were the filmstrips dealing with behavioral objectives helpful in aiding your understanding of them? (Circle One)

DY PY NOP PN DN

Explain:

9. Was the live introduction to the Durrell Analysis of Reading Difficulty adequate? (Circle One)

DY PY NOP PN DN

Explain:

10. Was the video taped introduction to the Durrell Analysis of Reading Difficulty adequate? (Circle One)

DY PY NOP PN DN

Explain:

11. Were you allowed ample time in working directly with the migrant children on diagnosing reading problems? (Circle One)

Yes No

Explain:

12. Were the live demonstrations with the migrant children (diagnosing difficulties in math) of value to you? (Circle One)

DY PY NOP PN DN

Explain:

13. At any time during the conference did you feel bored with the lecture material that was presented? (Circle One)

DY PY NOP PN DN

Explain: (Please list in rank order any classes or subject areas that did not hold your interest. Also indicate why.)

14. Was the rotational sequence (Facilitation of Learning Cyclical Model) through diagnosis, behavioral objective, activities, and evaluation (feedback) effective in aiding your understanding of learning? (Circle One)

DY PY NOP PN DN

Explain:

15. Do you feel that the fishbowl method of discussion/evaluation/ feedback has merit? (Circle One)

DY PY NOP PN DN

Explain:

16. Was the video recording helpful in providing feedback after diagnosing children's learning problems? (Circle One)

DY PY NOP PN DN

Explain:

17. Was the video taping a deterrent factor while diagnosing? (Circle One)

DY PY NOP PN DN

Explain:

18. Was it a good idea to have cognitive surveys after completing instruction in each area?

DY PY NOP PN DN

Explain:

19. Was your experience with video tape recorders valuable? (Circle One)

DY PY NOP PN DN

Explain:

20. Was your experience with the technical nature of video tape recorders valuable to you? (Circle One)

DY PY NOP PN DN

Explain:

21. Was your experience with the feedback capabilities of the video tape recorders valuable to you? (Circle One)

DY PY NOP PN DN

Explain:

22. Did you feel you were too rushed or pressured at any time during the conference? (Circle One)

DY PY NOP PN DN

Explain:

23. Was the reflection at Timberhaven on the first Friday (August 23) valuable as part of the conference? (Circle One)

DY PY NOP PN DN

Explain:

24. Did playing the game of Market serve as an appropriate starting point in learning how to design your own educational games? (Circle One)

DY PY NOP PN DN

Explain:

25. Was the game demonstration of "Aqua-Math" effective in meeting the objective of aiding your understanding of game components, play, and procedures? (Circle One)

DY PY NOP PN DN

Explain:

26. Was the rotational process concerning games (conducting diagnosis, setting objectives, designing a game, playing and evaluating the game) effective in aiding your understanding of the role of games in learning? (Circle One)

DY PY NOP PN DN

Explain:

27. Was designing your own game helpful to you? (Circle One)

DY PY NOP PN DN

Explain:

28. Did the competition among participants in game design add anything to the conference in your judgment? (Circle One)

DY PY NOP PN DN

Explain:

29. Did you feel the judgment of the games' competition was adequate? (Circle One)

DY PY NOP PN DN

Explain:

30. Do you plan to use games in your classroom? (Circle One)

DY PY NOP PN DN

Explain:

31. Do you feel games are appropriate for most migrant children (i.e., of all ages)? (Circle One)

DY PY NOP PN DN

Explain:

32. Do you consider games effective in motivating migrant children? (Circle One)

DY PY NOP PN DN

Explain:

33. Are there certain types of educational games that you think are more appropriate for migrant children? (Circle One)

DY PY NOP PN DN

Explain:

34. Was the question and answer session with Jack Hyams in the second week helpful to you? (Circle One)

DY PY NOP PN DN

Explain:

35. Was the first lecture by Mrs. Osborn on the rationale and methodology of the Bereiter technique helpful to you? (Circle One)

DY PY NOP PN DN

Explain:

36. What was your opinion of the demonstration that Mrs. Osborn put on with the six migrant children? (Circle One)

Very Effective Effective No Opinion Ineffective Very Ineffective

37. Was it a meaningful experience for you to watch migrant children play educational games? (Circle One)

DY PY NOP PN DN

Explain:

38. Was the film on Bereiter mathematics techniques of interest to you? (Circle One)

DY PY NOP PN DN

Was it presented at an appropriate time? (Circle One)

DY PY NOP PN DN

What was your opinion of the film?

39. Was the opportunity for you to apply the Bereiter technique meaningful to you? (Circle One)

DY PY NOP PN DN

Explain:

40. Was the fishbowl on the migrant school visit held Thursday afternoon of the second week meaningful to you? (Circle One)

DY PY NOP PN DN

Explain:

41. Were the techniques set up to provide rather rapid feedback to you after taking cognitive surveys helpful to you?

DY PY NOP PN DN

Explain:

42. Do you feel that you have had a voice in determining the types of activities in which you were engaged in this workshop? (Circle One)

DY PY NOP PN DN

Explain:

43. Do you feel that the conference staff were appropriate for this workshop? (Circle One)

DY PY NOP PN DN

Explain:

44. What changes would you recommend in staffing a conference like this in subsequent years? Please be specific.

45. Were the class days of appropriate length? (Circle One)

DY PY NOP PN DN

Explain:

46. Would you list below (in order of importance; most important first) five of the activities during the two weeks of the conference which you felt were least appropriate?

47. Would you list below (in order of importance; most important first) five of the activities during the two weeks of the conference which you felt were most appropriate?

48. What is your overall impression of the Facilitation of Learning Cyclical Model that was presented and referred to during the conference?

49. Did the Facilitation of Learning Cyclical Model assist you in seeing how various aspects of the conference were interrelated?

DY PY NOP PN DN

Explain:

50. Provided that important conflicts did not arise, would you be willing to attend a conference such as this next summer if it dealt with (at a higher level) facilitating the learning of the migrant child?

DY PY NOP PN DN

Explain:

51. What was your general overall opinion of the conference?

Very Effective	Effective	No Opinion	Ineffective	Very Ineffective

52. As a result of this two-week workshop experience, do you believe that you will change some of the behaviors you have used in the past when working with children in a learning situation?

DY	PY	NOP	PN	DN

Explain:

APPENDIX F
Instrument 5

Region L Educational Development Center
Department of Education
Bucknell University
Lewisburg, Pennsylvania
17837

September 26, 1968

MEMORANDUM

TO: Migrant Conference Participants

FROM: Dr. William L. Goodwin WLG

SUBJECT: Two-Week Migrant Conference

Now that the Conference has been over for four weeks, it would be very helpful (in preparing the booklet on the Migrant Conference) to know how you would respond to the following five items. If you need more room for your explanations, use the reverse side of the attached sheet.

On Items 4 and 5, the following symbols are used for your convenience in responding:

DY	Definitely Yes
PY	Probably Yes
PN	Probably No
DN	Definitely No
NA	Not Applicable (applies to Item 4 only)
NOP	No Opinion (applies to Item 5 only)

A pre-addressed envelope is enclosed for your mailing convenience. Thank you for your continuing assistance.

WLG:jmm

Enclosure

Name____ Date________________________

1. Have you been involved in any way this September (1968) in your school district with the education of migrant children? (Check the responses, one or more, that apply to you.)

_____ Yes, I have them in my class(es). If yes, how many children? _____.
_____ Yes, I have them in the school which I administer. If yes, how many? _____.
_____ No, I have had no contact or involvement with migrants.
_____ Other.

Please explain:

2. Have you had contact with other educators (i.e., teachers, principals, counselors, etc.) this September on matters concerning migrant children? (Check the responses, one or more that apply to you.)

_____ Yes, educators initiated contacts with me. If yes, how many educators? _____.
_____ Yes, I initiated contacts with educators. If yes, with how many educators? _____.
_____ No, I have had no contact with other educators on this matter.

Please explain:

3. Have you been involved in any way this September (1968) in your school district with the education of disadvantaged learners other than migrant children? (Check the responses, one or more, that apply to you.)

_____ Yes, I have them in my class(es). If yes, how many children? _____.
_____ Yes, I have them in the school which I administer. If yes, how many? _____.
_____ No, I have had no contact or involvement with disadvantaged learners.
_____ Other.

Please explain:

4. Do you find yourself doing anything different for pupils (and in your opinion better) as a result of your involvement in the Migrant Conference? (Answer three times, circling one symbol for each group of pupils.)

a) For migrant children only: DY PY PN DN NA

b) For other disadvantaged learners only: DY PY PN DN NA

c) For all other pupils (that is, not the pupils in a and b above):

DY PY PN DN NA

Please explain:

5. In your opinion, at this point in time, was the Migrant Conference a valuable learning experience for you as a professional educator?

DY PY PN DN NOP

Please explain: